Com. d. 698. 6

Dr. BENTLEY'S DISSERTATIONS ON THE *Epiſtles of* PHALARIS, AND THE **Fables of** ÆSOP, EXAMIN'D

By the Honourable

Charles Boyle, Eſq;

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

—— *Remember* Milo's *End*;
Wedg'd in that Timber which he ſtrove to rend.
Roſcom. Eſſ. of Tranſl. Verſ.

LONDON,
Printed for *Tho. Bennet*, at the *Half-moon* in St. *Paul's Church-yard*. 1698.

DISSERTATIONS

ON THE

EPISTLES OF PHALARIS

AND THE

Fables of Æsop

EXAMINED

13—257,8

By the Honourable

Charles Boyle, Esq;

Remedia Malis ; Fer, Ure, Seca.
Med. ad Autol. Rubr. ad Lib. Pyth.
Rubr. ad Lib. Epod.

LONDON,

Printed for Tho. Bennet, at the Half-Moon
in St. Paul's Church-yard. 1695.

THE PREFACE.

SOON after Dr. Bentley's Dissertation came out, I was call'd away into Ireland, to attend the Parliament there. The Publick Business, and my own private affairs, detain'd me a great while in that Kingdom, else the World should have had a much Earlier account of Him, and his Performance. For tho' He took above two Years to make his Learned Reflections on Phalaris; yet Two Months would have been enough to have shown him, that he is but a weak Champion in a very frivolous Cause.

I speak not this out of any vain design of setting up for a Quick Writer, but meerly to avoid being thought to have thrown away any considerable part of my life upon so trifling a subject: which, as Idle a man as I am, is an Imputation I would not willingly lye under.

I little imagin'd ever to have been engag'd in a Dispute of this nature. I am not very fond of Controversies even where the Points debated are of some importance; but in trivial matters, and such as Mankind is not at all concern'd in, methinks they are unpardonable. This, ever since I came to have any Opinions of my own, has been one of 'em; and is still, tho' I am unluckily at present brought to act contrary to it. But the Case is this — Dr. Bentley has been pleas'd, with some warmth, to fall foul on an Edition and Version of Phalaris's Epistles,

that I some years since offer'd to the World. He has taken a great deal of Good-natur'd pains to prove, that I had been very foolishly busying my self upon a Contemptible and Spurious Author; and had made a bad book much worse by a very ill Edition of it. I was very Young, when I appear'd on that occasion; and I appear'd rather as one that wish'd well to Learning than profess'd it; and for both these reasons promis'd my self good usage from the men of more profound Skill in such matters. Dr. Bentley *was sensible that his Criticisms would lye under some disadvantage on this account; and therefore, to excuse his making so free with the Edition, was pleas'd to make yet freer with Me; and, according to His Breeding, to tell Me, and all the World, that I had set my name to a Book, which did not belong to me.*

The first of these Reflections, had it come single, I could easily have neglected: had he stop'd there, I would have left the Book to shift for it self, and Him to the good opinion he has of his own performances, without endeavouring to lessen it. But when he carried his Criticisms so far as to assert, not only of Phalaris, *but his* Editor *too, that they neither of 'em wrote what was ascrib'd to 'em; he gave me so plain, and so publick an Affront, that I could not, with any tolerable regard to my reputation, quietly put it up. Thus was I, much against my inclinations, brought into the Lists. It was necessary for me to say something in defence of my self; and when I did so, I thought it would be judg'd proper for me to say something too in defence of my Author; and to enquire into the justness of those Criticisms which Dr.* Bentley *has advanc'd on this occasion; and which, I foresaw, wou'd be look'd upon, as in some measure aim'd at Me, tho' they did not really belong to me.*

I have not any where in my Book asserted, that the Epistles, *which carry* Phalaris's *name, are Genuine; and I am not therefore engag'd to defend their Reputation against the Attacks of Dr.* Bentley, *or any other person, who, by the help of Leisure and Lexicons, shall set up for a Critic in this point. But as I have not undertaken for their being Genuine, so neither have I, with a decisive and assuming air, pronounc'd 'em Spurious. I expres's'd my self with that Caution and Reserve in this matter, which I thought became a Young Writer, who was sensible, that the best and ablest Judges were divided in their opinions about it; and I thought it would be a very Indecent part in Me, to make my self a Judge between 'em.*

But I was chiefly indue'd to observe these measures, by the Regard I had for the most Accomplish'd Writer of the Age, *whom I never think of, without calling to mind those happy Lines of* Lucretius,

Quem Tu, Dea, Tempore in omni
Omnibus ornatum voluisti excellere rebus.

a Character, which, I dare say, Memmius *did not better deserve, than Sir* William Temple. *He had openly declar'd in favour of the Epistles: and the Nicety of his Taste was never, I think, disputed by Such as had any themselves. I quoted his Words with that respect which is due to ev'ry thing that comes from him: but must now beg his pardon for it; for I have by this means, I find, drawn him into a share of Dr.* Bentley's *displeasure: who has hereupon given himself the trouble of writing almost fourscore pages solemnly to disprove that One of Sir* William's *which he has prefix'd to his Dissertation; and which, to give him my opinion of his*

whole

whole Book at once, is the only good Page there.

I am therefore the rather inclin'd to give Dr. Bentley's *Reflections a Due Examination, on Sir* William Temple's *account; upon whom I so unhappily occasion'd this Storm of Criticism to fall. In truth, for a Man who has been so great an Ornament to Learning, he has had strange usage from Some who are Retainers to it. He had set the world a Pattern of mixing Wit with Reason, Sound Knowledge with Good Manners; and of making the one serve to recommend and set off the other; but his Copy has not been at all follow'd by those that have writ against him, in a very rough way, and without that Respect which was due both to His Character, and their Own.*

I will not pretend to determine, on which side, in those Disputes, the Truth lies; only thus much I will venture to say of 'em, that, let Sir W. T. *be as much out in some of his Opinions as he's represented to be, yet They, who read both sides, will be apt to fall in with* Tully's *Opinion of* Plato, *and say,* Cum illo Ego mehercle errare malim quàm cum istis Scriptoribus vera sentire. *I had rather be so Handsomly mistaken as He is, if he be mistaken, than be so Rudely and Dully in the right, as Some of his Opposers, allowing 'em to be in the right, are.*

There was also another Consideration that determin'd me to write. Dr. Bentley's *Reflections were understood to go further than either Sir* William Temple, *or my Self; and to be levell'd at a* Learned Society, *in which I had the happiness to be educated: and which Dr.* Bentley *is suppos'd to attack under those General Terms of* Our New Editors, Our Annotators, *and* Those Great Genius's with whom Learning, that is leaving the world, has taken up her last Residence.

By

By these, and such expressions as these, with which his Familiar Epistle abounds, he would insinuate as if Phalaris, *as slight a piece as it is, had been made up by contribution from several hands, and were the Joint Work of that Eminent Body. But in this he does me too great an honour; and I'm almost tempted to take it, as* Terence *did the agreeable Reproach of* Lælius *and* Scipio's *writing his Plays for him; neither to own nor deny it. But* Terence *wrote what might have become those Noble Pens; and therefore did no injury to their Reputation when he favour'd that mistake: whereas I shou'd be extreamly to blame, if I shou'd suffer a Report to spread to the disadvantage of so many Excellent Men. I think my self therefore oblig'd to declare, that whatever the Faults of* Phalaris *are, they are Mine; and I alone am answerable for them. There is a very Deserving Gentleman indeed, who had a little before been the Director of my Studies, and was then My Particular Friend, to whom I have acknowledgments to make on this occasion. I consulted him upon any difficulty, because I thought it not proper for one of my Age to offer any thing to the Public without consulting Some-body. I wish I had advis'd oftener with him, for then my Book would have been much more correct. But excepting Him, no one had a hand in it; nay, scarce a line was ever seen by any-body else as I know of, till it was finish'd. And now I have confess'd thus much, I don't care if I own a little further to Dr.* Bentley, *that I have been again oblig'd to the Same person for his Assistance in consulting some Books in the* Oxford Libraries *at my request, which in the Places where I have been, were not at all, or not easily, to be met with. The Dr. may make what advantages of this he thinks fit; I assure him, I will never recriminate;*

for

for I declare to the World, that I sincerely believe the Dr's Dissertation is entirely his own, both as to Matter and Dress; and that no Friend whatever, no not Mr. Wotton himself, had any hand in it. The happy Genius of some Authors will for ever secure 'em from all Scandals of this nature: Terence indeed was suspected, but Bavius and Mœvius never were. Dr. Bentley has industriously contriv'd to lead his Reader into this mistake; imagining, I suppose, that the Conquest would have been too cheap for a man of his Rank in Letters, unless he engag'd, like the Hero of a Romance, with great numbers at once. But some men have thought themselves Heroes that were not, and some that were, have mistaken their Strength, and in either of these cases have come off but scurvily. The Dr, I'm sure, would have been made very sensible of this in the present Debate, had not I been kinder to him than He was to Himself, and stept in, as I thought it became me, between Him and the just resentments of that Learned Body. 'Twere pity that any of those worthy Men, who know so well how to employ their hours, should be diverted from the pursuit of Useful Knowledge, into such Trivial Enquiries as these. The Dispute began between Dr. Bentley, and Me; and 'tis fit that We Two should end it.

I have a Request to Such as shall give themselves the Trouble of perusing These Papers, that they would do Me, and Dr. Bentley, the Justice to compare 'em, Paragraph by Paragraph, with His Dissertation. The Task is a little unreasonable, considering the Length of the Dispute; but 'tis necessary, in order to form a true judgment of the Performance.

Dr.

Dr. BENTLEY's Diſſertation UPON THE Epiſtles of *Phalaris*, &c. EXAMIN'D:

DR. *Bentley*, in the Piece I am about to examine, among ſeveral other Liberties, has taken this, of writing without any Method. Great Genius's indeed are above ordinary Rules: but it wou'd ill become ſo unknown a Writer as I am, to exempt my ſelf from 'em; and therefore I ſhall preſcribe my ſelf a method in anſwering him.

I think moſt of the ſcatter'd Remarks he has made, in that part of his Diſſertation which relates to *Phalaris*, will come under one of theſe Three Heads; They are either ſome *Arguments*, which he has urg'd for the *Spuriouſneſs* of the *Epiſtles*; or ſome *Faults* which he has found with my *Edition* and *Verſion* of 'em; or ſome *Matters of Fact*

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

which he has related, as the Grounds of his peeviſh Quarrel.

Theſe laſt he has thrown into an odd corner of his Book, as it were out of ſight; and plac'd 'em in the Rear of all his learned Arguments. One wou'd imagine, by the Poſt he has given 'em, that he diſtruſted their ſtrength, or that he wrote his Book firſt, and found Reaſons for it afterwards. However that may be, I think my ſelf oblig'd to clear up this Point in the firſt place, by ſetting thoſe *Matters of Fact* in their true light, which Dr. *Bentley* has extreamly diſguis'd; And then 'twill be time to conſider the *Wonderful Proofs* he has produc'd on his ſide, and the *Mighty Miſtakes* he has thought fit to charge me with.

About four or five Years ago, the worthy Dean of *Chriſtchurch*, Dr. *Aldrich*, (of whoſe College I was then a Member) deſir'd me to undertake an Edition of *Phalaris*. I cou'd deny Him nothing, to whom I ow'd ſo much; and therefore, as unfit as I thought my ſelf for ſuch a Task, I undertook it. In order to it, a Manuſcript *Phalaris* in the *King's Library* was to be conſulted. It was of no Age of Worth, I heard, being written but juſt before the reſtauration of Letters; however it was a Manuſcript, and therefore not to be neglected; eſpecially ſince we had no ancient Copies, either in *England*, or any where elſe, that I cou'd hear of. I ſent to Mr. *Bennet*, my Bookſeller in *London*, to get the Manuſcript, and deſir'd him to apply himſelf to

Dr.

Dr. *Bentley*, in my name, for the use of it; not doubting in the least a ready complyance with such a request, from one of his Station and Order; and who besides was at that very time in a Lecture of some Honour and Profit that had lately been set up by one of my Family: especially, since the Book, which I desir'd to borrow, was of so little importance, that it had scarce been a Favour to have lent it me, if I had not ask'd it. After an Expectation of many months, Mr. *Bennet* sent me at last a Collation of part of the Manuscript, with this account; that he had, with a great difficulty, and after long delays, got the Manuscript into his hands; that he had it but a very few days, when Dr. *Bentley* came to demand it again; and wou'd, by no means, be prevail'd upon to let him have the use of it any longer, tho' he told him, the Collation was not perfected: and that he deny'd this Request in a very rude manner, throwing out several slight and disparaging Expressions, both of me, and the Work I was about.

This I had reason to take very ill of Dr. *Bentley*, and therefore in that part of my *Preface*, where I gave an account of the MSS. that were consulted in that Edition, I inserted these words, [*Collatas etiam curavi usq; ad Epistolam* 40 *cum* MS° *in Bibliothecâ Regiâ; cujus mihi copiam ulteriorem Bibliothecarius, pro singulari suâ humanitate, negavit.*] which, considering the usage I had had from him, was as soft a thing as I cou'd well allow my self to say. The Epistles were no sooner publish'd, but Dr. *Bentley* sent me a Letter;

wherein, after expressing himself with great civility to me, he represented the Matter of Fact quite otherwise than I had heard it. I return'd him immediately as civil an Answer, to this effect: That Mr. *Bennet*, whom I employ'd to wait on him in my name, gave me such an account of his Reception, that I had reason to apprehend my self affronted: and, since I cou'd make no other excuse to my Reader, for not collating the King's MS. but because 'twas deny'd me, I thought I cou'd do no less than express some resentment of that Denial. That I shou'd be very much concern'd if Mr. *Bennet* had dealt so ill with me, as to mislead me in his accounts; and, if that appear'd, shou'd be ready to take some opportunity of begging his pardon: and, as I remember, I express'd my self so, that the Dr. might understand, I meant to give him satisfaction as publickly as I had injur'd him. Here the matter rested, and I thought Dr. *Bentley* was satisfied; especially since, I found, Mr. *Bennet* persisted in his account, and supported it with further proofs; and the Dr. seem'd willing to let the Dispute drop, by his not writing to me any further about it, or discourling Mr. *Bennet* concerning it, to whom my Letter plainly refer'd him. In this Mistake was I, for Two Years and an half after the Edition of *Phalaris*; till at last Dr. *Bentley*'s Dissertation came out, and convinc'd me, that he had had Vengeance in his Heart all the time, and suspended his Blow only till he cou'd strike, as he thought, to purpose. In this angry Discourse of his, he tells the World the same story (but ing a Cir-

cumstance

cumſtance or two which he has alter'd) that he had told me before in his Letter. His words are theſe: *A Bookſeller came to me in the name of the Editors, to beg the uſe of the Manuſcript. It was not then in my cuſtody: but as ſoon as I had the power of it, I went* P. 68. *voluntarily and offer'd it him, bidding him tell the Collator not to loſe any time; for I was ſhortly to go out of Town for two Months. 'Twas deliver'd, w'd, and return'd: Not a word ſaid by the Bearer, nor the leaſt ſuſpicion in me, that they had not finiſh'd the Collation.*

Startled at theſe Aſſertions thus reviv'd, after a long Silence, and improv'd in Print, I examin'd Mr. *Bennet* again very ſtrictly and particularly. He aſſur'd me, that every word he had writ to me upon this occaſion was punctually true; and that Dr. *Bentley*'s account, where it differ'd from his, was entirely falſe. He drew up the Matter of Fact in writing, and ſet his Hand to it; giving me liberty to make it publick, and to aſſure the World, that he was ready to juſtifie the truth of what he had written with his Oath, when it ſhou'd be duly requir'd of him. He added, that Mr. *Gibſon*, the Collator, cou'd confirm ſome circumſtances of his Account; and that his Brother (who was his Apprentice at that time, and was ſent by him both to Dr. *Bentley*, and to the Collator) wou'd have atteſted the Truth of the Whole, had he been alive; but he dy'd ſome Months after this Matter happen'd. However, if his own Teſtimony, and the Collator's, ſhou'd be liable to Suſpicion, yet ſtill there was a Gentleman of known Credit in the World,

Dr. King *of the Commons*, who was witneſs to all that paſs'd at one meeting, between him and Dr. *Bentley*; and wou'd, he hop'd, be ſo juſt to him as to give an account of it. He was not miſtaken; for Dr. *King*, being apply'd to by a Friend of mine, preſently wrote him the following Letter: which, together with the ſeveral Certificates of Mr. *Bennet* and Mr. *Gibſon*, I here offer to the Reader.

WHereas the *Reverend Dr.* Bentley *has thought fit, in the* Appendix *to Mr.* Wotton's *Reflexions on Ancient and Modern Learning*, (p. 66, & 67.) *to inſert the following words as Matter of Fact*, [*viz.* A Bookſeller *came to me in the name of the Editors, &c.*] *I think my ſelf oblig'd to give the World the following account, wherein I have faithfully related what paſſed on that occaſion.*

See the Paſſage at length, p. 5.

I was imploy'd by the Honourable Mr. Boyle, *(and by him only) to borrow the MS. of* Phalaris *from Dr.* Bentley. *After about* Nine Months *ſolicitation, it was deliver'd into my cuſtody, without any time limited for the return of it. Within few days after, Dr.* Bentley *call'd upon me, to have it reſtor'd, and Then told me, that he was to go into the Country. He ſtaid till I ſent to the Collator, and word was brought by the Meſſenger, that it was not collated. I then beg'd him to let me have it but till Sunday Morning, (it was Saturday Noon when he came) and I engag'd to oblige the Collator to ſit up all Saturday Night, to get it finiſh'd. But he utterly refus'd to leave it with me any longer, demanding to have it ſent that Day to* Weſtminſter, *(which was done accordingly) and not giving me any the leaſt hopes, that*

that if I apply'd to him upon his return out of the Country, I ſhou'd have leave to get the Collation perfected. Theſe Circumſtances I am thus particular in, becauſe I had occaſion to recollect 'em not long afterwards, when Mr. Boyle's *Book came out, and Letters paſs'd between him and Dr.* Bentley, *concerning the Paſſage in his Preface.*

It may not be proper, conſidering my Imployment, for me to add an account of the Reflections Dr. Bentley *was pleas'd to make from time to time, when I ſpoke to him from Mr.* Boyle, *for the Uſe of the MS. He has repreſented me as having ſaid too much on that ſubject. But, by good fortune, Dr.* King *was preſent at one of the Meetings, and heard all that paſs'd there. I hope he will do Juſtice on this occaſion.*

July 13. 1697. Thomas Bennet.

I Very well remember, that Mr. Bennet *ſent his Man to me for* Phalaris's Epiſtles, *whilſt I was collating 'em; and being unwilling to part with them, before I had gone through 'em, I ſent the Man back without them. But he preſently return'd, and told me, that the Gentleman, that own'd them, ſtaid at their Shop for them, and cou'd not ſpare them any longer: This is the true reaſon, why I cou'd collate no more of the abovemention'd Epiſtles.*

Witneſs my Hand,

July 13. 1697. Geo. Gibſon.

SIR,

I Am bound in Justice to answer your request, by endeavouring, as far as I can, to recollect what past between Mr. Bennet and Dr. Bentley, concerning a MS. of the Epistles of Phalaris. I cannot be certain as to any other Particulars, than that, among other things, the Dr. said, that if the MS. were collated, it wou'd be worth nothing for the future. Which I took the more notice of, because I thought a MS. good for nothing, unless it were collated. The whole Discourse was manag'd with such Insolence, that after he was gone, I told Mr. Bennet, that he ought to send Mr. Boyle word of it: that, for my own part, (I said then what I think still) I did not believe that the Various Readings of any Book were so much worth, as that a Person of Mr. Boyle's Honour and Learning, shou'd be us'd so scurvily to obtain 'em. That scorn and contempt which I have naturally for Pride and Insolence, makes me remember that, which otherwise I might have forgot. Believe me, Sir, to be

Your faithful Friend,

and humble Servant,

William King.

Doctors Commons, Octob. 13. 1697.

Bentley's own words:

"When once the MS. was collated for the various Lections it would be no better than a squeezed Orange."

Sic Corrig. ex Mens. Autoris Ric. Bentleii.

The

The Caſe then between me and Dr. *Bentley* ſtands thus. There is, on the one ſide, Dr. *Bently*'s ſingle Aſſertion, in his own cauſe; and theſe ſeveral concurring Accounts, from Perſons of Probity and Worth, on the other. The queſtion now is (if it be a queſtion) which of theſe ought to be credited; the Point to me is ſo clear, that I dare truſt the moſt partial Friend Dr. *Bentley* has to determine it.

Mr. *Bennet* and Mr. *Gibſon*, I think, are ſo little intereſted in this Diſpute, that they may be entirely depended upon. However, Dr. *King* is a Witneſs without Exception; and the account he gives of one of thoſe *Free Conferences* Dr. *Bentley* held with Mr. *Bennet*, is full and home; and I do aſſure our Learned Critic, that whatever becomes of *Phalaris*'s Letters, this of Dr. *King*'s is not ſpurious. I have the Original of it by me under his own hand, as I have the Originals too of the other Papers, which ſhall be at Dr. *Bentley*'s, or any man's ſervice, that pleaſes to command a ſight of 'em.

And now had I not reaſon to ſay what I did, and much more than I did, of Dr. *Bentley*, in my Preface to *Phalaris?* Cou'd I reſent the harſh Treatment he had given me in Gentler Terms than I there made uſe of? Since he had deny'd me ſo common a favour, and ſpoken of me with ſo much contempt, I was at Liberty, I think, to have return'd his Civilities in what way I pleas'd, and to have given him any Language whatever that it was not below me to give. And

that

that is a Reſtraint which, I hope, I ſhall always be able to lay upon my ſelf, whatever the Provocation be.

Dr. *Bentley* then, conſidering all things, was really oblig'd to me, for uſing him with ſo much Tenderneſs. What way did he take of owning his Obligations? He immediately enter'd upon the Honourable and Chriſtian Deſign of expoſing me; and reſolv'd, whatever Time or Pains it might coſt him, to prove, that the Epiſtles I had put out were a ridiculous Cheat; and that I (or whoever the Editor was) was to be pity'd, for giving my ſelf ſo much trouble about them.

I ſee Monſieur *Rochfaucaut* drew his Obſervation from Nature, when he ſaid, *We often pardon thoſe that injure us, but we can never forgive thoſe that we injure.* In about two or three years time he had atchiev'd this mighty Work, and compaſs'd a Diſſertation as big as *Phalaris* it ſelf, to make his Point good. There, that he might be wanting in no inſtance of *Humanity*, he tells the World, that the Edition of *Phalaris* was not mine, but only *aſcrib'd* to me; and, be it whoſe it would, that 'twas a faulty and a fooliſh one: and then tells me too, in the ſame breath, that nothing of this was *intended as a diſparagement to me*; to ſhow his Reader, I ſuppoſe, that he had as mean an Opinion of my Underſtanding, as he had of my Learning. He names me not indeed, but in his civil way of Circumlocution, calls me, *That young Gentleman of great hopes whoſe Name is ſet to the Edition.* But what great hopes cou'd the World have had of a young Gentleman,

man, who ſhou'd have ſuffer'd the Lye to be publickly given him, in a matter, where his Reputation, both as a Scholar and a Man of Honour, was nearly concern'd, and yet had either not Senſe enough to diſcern the Affront, or not Spirit enough to reſent it?

Dr. *Bentley* was not ſatisfied with giving me ill Uſage, unleſs he did it in ill Words too; and therefore has cull'd out the very worſt he cou'd find, to beſtow on me: for ſurely no man of Liberal Education cou'd put together ſo many unmannerly and ſlovenly expreſſions without ſtudying for 'em. He charges me with *Calumny* [a], *weak Detraction* [a], *Injuſtice* [a], *Forgery* and *Slander* [a]; with the *baſeſt Tricks* [b], and a *vile Aſperſion* [b]: He tells me, that a certain Perſon, *tho' a ſorry Critic, was yet a degree above me* [c]; and, that *Printing* [c] *is a Sword in the hand of a Child* [d]; meaning, I ſuppoſe, his humble Servant.

[a] p. 66. [b] p. 71. [c] p. 75. [d] p. 67.

He likens me, by a very elegant Simily, to a *Bungling Tinker mending Old Kettles* [e], in one place; and, by the help of a Greek Proverb, calls me downright *Aſs* [f] in another. The correcting the faults of my Verſion is, in his polite way of writing, *the cleanſing of* Augeas's *Stables*; and, to carry on the Metaphor, he ſays, *The Firſt Epiſtle coſt him four Pages in ſcowring.*

[e] p. 76. [f] p. 74.

Theſe are the Flowers, which Dr. *Bentley* has, with no very ſparing hand, ſtrew'd throughout every Page almoſt of his Learned Epiſtle. It can hardly be imagin'd, how one, that lives within the Air of a Court, ſhou'd prevail with himſelf to deal in ſuch dirty Language: the Chairmen at St. *James*'s, I dare

dare say, manage their Disputes with more decency. I find the Dr. has not profited much by the dependence he once had on a *Great Man*, who might have taught him, would he have vouchsaf'd to learn it, the Secret of engaging deep with an Adversary, without Loss of Temper, or Breach of Good Manners.

Chaplain to Bp. Stillingfleet

But he will tell me, that few, or none of these expressions were levell'd at Me; and that for a very obliging reason; because I am not included among the *Editors* of *Phalaris*. Let 'em have been levell'd at whom he will, they are inexcusable. Chew'd Bullets are not more against the Law of Arms, than such ways of speech are against the rules of good writing.

Dr. *Bently* cou'd not have taken a better way of justifying me in what I said of him, than by writing in this manner he has done; and with so little of that *Humanity*, the want of which I objected to him. Most Readers will be apt to think that he might probably always want it as much as they see he does now. So that if I needed further Vouchers than those which I have already brought, I wou'd call in his own Dissertation to witness for me, that I have not wrong'd him, nor given him any Character but what he has since been courteously pleas'd to make good.

But Dr. *Bently* appeals from me to more Equitable Judges; and tells me, that he *can*

P. 68. *produce several Letters from Learned Professors abroad, (whose Books in time I may be fit to read) wherein these very same words* [pro singulari

sha

ſuâ humanitate] *are ſaid of him ſeriouſly and candidly. For I endeavour* (ſays he) *to oblige even Foreigners by all Courteſie and Humanity; much more wou'd I encourage and aſſiſt any uſeful deſign at home.*

But why muſt we go to Foreign Nations for a true account of Dr. *Bently*? I thought Mens Characters had been beſt learnt from thoſe among whom they convers'd. The Law of *England* is, that every man ſhall be try'd by his Country and his Neighbourhood: and this is not more reaſonable in the Caſe of Life and Death, than in that of Reputation. But Dr. *Bently* pleads to have a Jury of Foreign Profeſſors impanell'd to ſit upon him: a very ſuſpicious Defence, I think; and which ought, without any more ado, to condemn him. Shou'd a man tax'd with ill breeding here at *London* (where he has liv'd all his time) produce Certificates in his behalf from ſome Correſpondents in *Cornwall*, or *Cumberland*, wou'd this Plea paſs at Court? Granting Dr. *Bently*'s Foreigners to have ſaid thoſe things of him which he ſays they have, 'tis becauſe they are Foreigners; We, that have the happineſs of a near converſation with him, know him better; and may perhaps take an opportunity of ſetting thoſe miſtaken Strangers right in their Opinions concerning him.

Thus much, upon the Suppoſition that he has theſe Teſtimonials by him: but I, who have had ſome dealings with him, have learnt a little to miſtruſt his accounts; and ſhall therefore, before I make any more Remarks upon this paſſage, tell the Reader a Story.

There

There was, not many Years ago, a Diſpute about a Point of Hiſtory, between an Ingenious Gentleman and a *Learned Prelate* of our Church, well known to Dr. *Bently*. When the Gentleman was at a loſs for Proofs, his laſt reſort always was to a certain Cheſt at *Ilcomkil*, where there were MSS. it ſeems, never ſeen by any body beſides himſelf, that prov'd every thing he had a mind to. This preſently put an end to the Controverſie: for there was no diſputing againſt Inviſible Authorities. How far this may be Dr. *Bently*'s caſe, and whether the Letters from Learned Profeſſors abroad, which he talks of, may not lye in ſome ſuch Cheſt as thoſe Records lay in, I will not pretend to determine. However, ſince they are MSS. I know his Fondneſs for thoſe precious Jewels ſo well, that I believe he'l be ſhy of making 'em publick. Till he does, the Printed Proofs that have been given of his great *Humanity* will ſtand good againſt what he tells us has been written to him.

Sure I am, there are ſome Learned Men abroad, that are far from Complimenting him. One of 'em, a Man of great note, has complain'd to me, how ill he has been us'd by him, in a Caſe nearly reſembling mine; and complain'd in very expreſſive Terms; which, not yet having his Leave for it, I do not think my ſelf at liberty to publiſh.

Another, that was deſirous to have a ſight of the *Alexandrian* MS. and apply'd himſelf to Dr. *Bently* very earneſtly for it, met with no other Anſwer to his Requeſt, but that *the Library was not fit to be ſeen.* A pretty

Ex-

Excuſe for a Library-keeper to make, who had been four Years in that Service! And this Inſtance of his *Humanity*, I aſſure him, is of no Old date; it happen'd ſince he purg'd himſelf in his new Diſſertation, and gave Learned Men encouragement to expect better uſage.

If he goes on at this rate, as we have no reaſon to doubt but he will, Foreigners will begin to ſuſpect, whether we have, as we pretend, the *Alexandrian* MS. or indeed whether the King has any Library. *too truly hitt!* *for that very MS was in D^r B^y's Library at Cambridge, cum aliis MSS.*

But becauſe the Dr. ſtrongly argues from *his being ready to oblige even Foreigners by all Courteſie and Humanity*, that he wou'd *much more be ready to do ſo to Learned Men at home*: I will add one Domeſtick Inſtance of that kind; that my Inſtances may be every way as large as his Aſſertions.

I have now a Letter by me under the hand of Sir *Edward Sherburn*, (a Gentleman of known Worth and Learning) wherein he has theſe words; *I have ſent* Rubenius's *Book*, [*de vitâ Mallii*, put out by *Grævius* in *Holland*, and dedicated to Dr. *Bently*] *the honour of whoſe Publication Mr.* Bently *hath ungratefully robb'd me of.* The meaning of this is explain'd in a Latin *Memorandum* enter'd by Sir *Edward* in the Book it ſelf; where he ſays, that *he put the MS. into Dr.* Bently's *hands, under this Condition, that he ſhou'd ſend it to* Grævius *to be publiſh'd, letting him know from whence he had it, and deſiring him to make an honourable mention of him, as the perſon that had oblig'd the World with it. The Edition came out, it was dedicated to Dr.* Bently,

ly; *the honour of the Publication given to him; and not one word of Sir* Edward Sherburn *ſaid in it.* The Sophiſts are every where pelted by Dr. *Bently*, for putting out what they wrote in other mens names; but I did not expect to hear ſo loudly of it from one that has ſo far outdone 'em: For, I think, 'tis much worſe to take the honour of another man's Book to one's ſelf, than to entitle ones own Book to another man.

But *Grævius*, it may be, was in fault; and forgot to do Sir *Edward Sherburn* juſtice. 'Tis hardly to be imagin'd he cou'd, had Dr. *Bently* told him plainly, that the MS. was put into his hands under that expreſs Condition: But if the Dr. only gave ſome ſlight intimation of it, *Grævius* might indeed forget to do what he did not know whether it were in good earneſt expected of him, or not.

But ſuppoſing the original Omiſſion to have lain wholly at *Grævius*'s door, yet how came the Dr. to be ſo very quiet under it afterwards? Why did he not ſend immediately to Sir *Edward Sherburn* to excuſe it? Why did he not take care to have this Neglect repair'd in the next *Holland* Journal? Nothing of this was done; and therefore, ſhou'd the Dr. not have been the willing occaſion of the Miſtake, yet at leaſt he was very willing that it ſhou'd prevail.

Upon a view of this Story, I am apt to retract my Suſpicions about Dr. *Bently*'s Letters from Learned Profeſſors. He may perhaps have Teſtimonials of his Courteſie by him;

if

if he ſticks at no methods of procuring 'em: By ſuch Arts as theſe 'tis eaſie for a Man to get a Reputation of *Humanity* abroad, without deſerving to be much commended for his Honeſty at home. 'Tis an hard word, and which I ſhould not eaſily allow my ſelf to uſe, but that I think I may take a greater Liberty in another man's behalf, than in my own.

By Dr. *Bently*'s way of treating Sir *William Temple*, Sir *Edward Sherburn*, and my ſelf, one would imagine, that he had vow'd hoſtility to all Gentlemen pretending to Letters; that he thought they broke in upon a Trade which none but thoſe of the Body corporate of Profeſs'd Scholars ought to deal in; and ſo, looking upon 'em as the *Eaſt-India* Company does upon Interlopers, was reſolv'd to uſe 'em accordingly. *A Key to a Tragical History of this kind of a Scotch Ship, whose Crew were murdered by the East India Company's Men at Sea for interloping, discover'd by one of their Fellows who was present.*

By this time, the Reader is able to judge, how far my Character of Dr. *Bently* ſuits him, and how far he might juſtly expect to have that Character publickly given him; whether his *Humanity* be *Singular*, or not, and whether my Opinion be Singular concerning it. I hope I have now ſet the *Matters of Fact* in a true light; I have only ſome few Remarks to add on ſome Paſſages in the Story which Dr. *Bently* tells of this matter, in which either his Memory or his Sincerity fail'd him.

He begins his Account with a great (and I had almoſt ſaid a wilful) Miſtake: He ſays I have told the World in my Preface, that *I had Collated the King's MS. as far as the 40th Epiſtle, and would have done ſo throughout, but*

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

that the Library-keeper, &c. Whereas I told the World, not that *I had Collated that MS.* but that *I had taken care to get it Collated.* My words are, *Collatas etiam* [viz. Epistolas] *curavi cum* MS° *in Bibliothecâ Regiâ*, &c.

The Difference here, as slight as it may seem, is material; and Dr. *Bently*, one may guess, was aware of it. He saw very well, that, unless I was represented as having collated the King's MS. *my self*, he could not well lay the Mistakes of the Collation upon me; which he was resolv'd however to do to the utmost, and therefore gave that convenient Turn to his Matter of Fact at the Entrance, which might best serve to countenance his Criticisms that follow.

With this View, he makes an unfair and broken citation of my words in the Margin; placing there only thus much out of my Preface, [*MS° in Bibliothecâ Regiâ, cujus mihi copiam ulteriorem Bibliothecarius, pro singulari suâ humanitate, negavit*] and taking no notice of the words that introduce these, [*Collatas etiam curavi cum*] without which the Sentence is imperfect, and unintelligible.

Dr. *Bently* could not have given us a better Earnest of his Integrity, at his first setting out: The rest of his Account, we shall find, is wrote with the same degree of Truth and Fairness. *The true Story* (says he) *is thus: A Bookseller came to me in the name of the Editors, to beg* (he would say, *desire*) *the use of the MS.* He knows very well, that Mr. *Bennet* went to him in my name only; Mr. *Bennet* himself is positive in the point: but least

the Dr. ſhould deny it, I have, by good luck, preſerv'd ſo much of his Letter by me, as relates to this Particular. There he was pleas'd to uſe theſe Civil Expreſſions: *Mr.* Bennet *deſir'd me to lend him the Manuſcript* Phalaris, *to be collated, becauſe a Young Gentleman, Mr.* Boyle *of* Chriſtchurch, *was going to publiſh it. I told him, that a Gentleman of that Name and Family, to which I had ſo many Obligations, and ſhou'd always have an honour for, might command any Service that lay in my Power.*

But now he ſays, that Mr. *Bennet* came to him in the Name of the *Editors*. How came I to be multiply'd at this rate? unleſs he has recollected himſelf ſince, and remembers the little Circumſtances of this Tranſaction better at two or three Years diſtance, than he did immediately after it happen'd.

He proceeds in his *True Story*. — *It was not then in my Cuſtody; but as ſoon as I had the power of it, I went voluntarily, and offer'd it him.* What he means by its *not being in his Cuſtody*, whether that he had lent it to ſome-body elſe, or that he was not yet fully enter'd on his Office, or that he had it not in his Pocket, muſt be a Secret, till he pleaſes to explain himſelf. Whatever his meaning be, the Reader is deſir'd to take notice, that there was about Nine Months Sollicitation us'd to procure it: A longer time than he needed to retrieve it out of the Hands of Thoſe to whom he might have lent it, or than the Ceremony of his Inauguration to his Library-keeper's Place cou'd require. I'm ſure he was much nimbler with my Col-

lator; for, inſtead of *Nine Months*, he would not allow him *Nine Days* time to peruſe it in.

His next words are, *bidding him tell the Collator not to loſe any time*, (which, tranſlated into Engliſh, is, *bidding him let the Collator know, that* he *muſt not loſe any time*) *for I was ſhortly to go out of Town for two Months.* This, I have reaſon to think, is pure Fiction; Mr. *Bennet* remembers nothing of it: but he very well remembers, that when the Dr. came to demand the MS. of him agen, he *then* told him, he was to go into the Country, and gave that for his reaſon why he could allow him no further time to collate it in. It was a mighty Treaſure it ſeems; the Credit of the King's Library depended on the *Alexandrian* MS. and That; and therefore he would not truſt it out of thoſe Walls a day longer. Beſides, (which is a Circumſtance, that tho' Dr. *Bently* has, yet Dr. *King* has not forgotten) *had it been collated, it would have been worth nothing for the future.* This was an Objection not to be got over, eſpecially ſince Mr. *Bennet* had no Orders from me to take the proper way of removing it.

It follows, *'twas deliver'd, us'd, and return'd, not a word ſaid by the Bearer, nor the leaſt ſuſpicion in me, that they had not finiſh'd the Collation.* This is roundly averr'd; but the Reader has Mr. *Bennet*'s and Mr. *Gibſon*'s Certificates; and after comparing 'em with this Paſſage, may believe as he thinks fit.

Well,

Well, (ſays he) *the Collation, it ſeems, was ſent defective to* Oxon, *and the blame, I ſuppoſe, laid upon me.* Does he only *ſuppoſe* it? Did not I poſitively write him word, that it was laid upon him, and ſo laid upon him, that I was oblig'd to take notice of it? But he is to be excus'd for forgetting what I wrote to him, when it appears, that he has forgot what he himſelf wrote to me.

After a few Months, out comes the new Edition, with this Sting in the mouth of it. 'Twas a Surprize indeed to find there, that our MS. was not perus'd. Our MS! that is, His Majeſty's and Mine. I thought indeed by the Price Dr. *Bently* ſet upon the MS. he fancied himſelf to have ſome Intereſt in it: He ſpeaks out now, 'tis no longer the King's, but *Our MS. i. e.* Dr. *Bently*'s and the King's in common: An Expreſſion as much too familiar for a Library-keeper, as *Ego & Rex Meus* was for a Cardinal. I will not, for the future, ſo nicely obſerve his Indecencies, ſince I find he is ſo general and undiſtinguiſhing in 'em.

'Twas a Surprize indeed to find there, that our MS. was not perus'd. Could they not have ask'd for it agen then after my Return? Yes, I could, Sir, and have been deny'd it again; which I was not very willing to venture. I neither thought my ſelf ſo little, nor Dr. *Bently* ſo great, nor the MS. ſo conſiderable, that I ſhould make a ſecond Application for it after ſuch a Repulſe; no, not tho' I had been ſure of obtaining it: much leſs could I ever think of asking it

agen, when, by what Mr. *Bennet* had told me, I had all the reaſon in the world to think, I ſhould be agen deny'd it.

But there is a reaſon for every thing, (ſays the Dr.) and *the Myſtery was ſoon reveal'd!* A pretty decent Phraſe on ſo light an occaſion; but this is not the only inſtance, where the Critick has got the better of the Divine. Well, but how was the *Myſtery reveal'd?* why, *He had the hard Hap, it ſeems, in ſome private Converſation, to ſay, that the Epiſtles were ſpurious, and unworthy of a new Edition: Hinc Illæ Lachrymæ.* If he ſaid this, as he intimates he did, at *Oxford*, where the Book was then printing, he ſaid a very uncivil thing; and what, in his Dialect, he terms his *Hard Hap*, other People would be apt to call his *Ill Breeding*. However, I ſeriouſly declare I was utterly a ſtranger to this Diſcourſe of his, till he told me of it in Print. I might hear, perhaps, of his being in *Oxford*, but I had heard too much of his Diſcourſe with Mr. *Bennet*, to be curious in making any Enquiries into his private Converſation.

The Reader will excuſe this Tedious Deſcant on Dr. *Bently*'s Relation of Matter of Fact. *The true Story of our MS.* was a point of importance: my Honeſty was concern'd in this part of the Diſpute, the reſt only touches my Learning. Having therefore, I hope, juſtified my Conduct where it moſt became me to do it, the Matters of pure Criticiſm will give me no Concern, I'm ſure, tho' they may put me to ſome little Trouble. I ſhall enter upon 'em with the Indifference of a Gameſter, who plays but for a trifle,

which

which 'tis much the ſame to him whether he wins or loſes.

I ſhou'd now fall cloſely to my work, the Authority of *Phalaris*'s Epiſtles, but that there is an Introduction of Dr. *Bently*'s that lies in my way, and muſt firſt have a Reflexion or two beſtow'd upon it.

He begins it with telling us, *that Mr.* Wotton, *by the power of a long Friendſhip between 'em, engag'd him to write it.*

I hope Mr. *Wotton* will let the Publick know, that he neither engag'd his Friend to write upon this Subject in this manner, nor approv'd of theſe Diſcourſes, when written: which the World will preſume him to have done, till the contrary appears; and till he has diſclaim'd Dr. *Bentley*'s attempt as publickly, as he ſeems now to countenance and avow it. 'Tis a little ſtrange, that Mr. *Wotton* in a ſecond Edition of his Book, which he had diſcreetly taken care to purge of moſt things that look'd like ill Manners in himſelf, ſhou'd be prevail'd upon to allow a place to the ill Manners of another man. But I hear, and I am not unwilling to think, that Mr. *Wotton* receiv'd this Preſent at a venture from Dr. *Bently*, and let it be printed without giving himſelf the trouble of reading it. And I the rather fall in with this account, becauſe I find Mr *Wotton* in his Book * zealouſly vindicating the Age from the Imputation of Pedantry, and aſſuring us, that tho' the Citation of Scraps of Latin, and a nauſeous oſtentation of Reading were in faſhion Fifty or Sixty Years ago, yet that all that is now in a great meaſure diſus'd. Which I ſuppoſe he would ne-

* P. 415, & 416.

ver have done in ſome of the laſt Pages of his Book, if he had then known of the Diſſertation that immediately follows it.

A Gentleman of my acquaintance was obſerving to me, what a Motly, Unequal work, theſe two Pieces made, as they now lye together. Mr. *Wotton* (ſaid he) in his Reflections takes in the whole compaſs of Ancient and Modern Learning; and endeavours to ſhow wherein either of 'em has been defective, and wherein they have excell'd. A Large Deſign, fit for the Pen of my Lord *Bacon!* and in the well executing of which any one Man's Life would be uſefully ſpent! Dr. *Bentley* comes after him with a Diſſertation, half as big as his Book, to prove, that three or four ſmall Pieces aſcrib'd to ſome of the Ancients, are not ſo ancient as they pretend to be: a very inconſiderable Point; and which a wiſe man would grudge the throwing away a weeks thought upon, if he could gain it! and what then ſhall we ſay of Him, that has ſpent two or three years of his life, to loſe it? Mr. *W*'s motive to write was, he tells us, a piece of Publick Service that he hop'd he might do the World; Dr. *Bentley*'s plainly a private Picque, and ſuch as 'twas utterly unfit for him to act upon, either as a Scholar, or a Chriſtian; much more as he was one in Holy Orders, and that had undertaken the publick defence of Religion. Mr *W.* (continued he) is modeſt and decent; ſpeaks generally with reſpect of thoſe he differs from, and with a due diſtruſt of his own Opinions: Dr. *Bentley* is Poſitive and Pert; has

no

no regard for what other men have thought or ſaid, and no ſuſpicions that he is fallible. Mr. *W*'s Book has a Vein of Learning running through it, where there is no oſtentation of it: Dr. *Bentley*'s Appendix has all the Pomp and Show of Learning, without the Reality. In truth (ſaid he) there is ſcarce any thing, as the Book now ſtands, in which that and the Appendix agree, but in commending and admiring Dr. *Bentley*; in which they are ſo very much of a Piece, that one would think Dr. *Bentley* had writ both the one and the other.

But leaving theſe two Friends to the Pleaſure of their mutual Civilities, I ſhall go on to the reſt of my remarks on Dr. *Bentley*'s Introduction. After telling us then at whoſe Inſtance he wrote this famous Piece of Criticiſm, he begins to give us a caſt of his skill in the Point. Sir *W. Temple* had obſerv'd in favour of the Ancients; that *ſome of the Oldeſt Books we have are the beſt in their kinds.* To this Dr. *Bentley* replies, *That ſome of the Oldeſt Books are the beſt in their kinds, the ſame Perſon having the Double Glory of Invention and Perfection, is a thing obſerv'd even by ſome of the Ancients.* And for this he very learnedly quotes *Dion Chryſoſtome*: *But then* (ſays he) *the Authors they gave this Honour to, are* Homer *and* Archilochus, *one the Father of Heroic Poem, and the other of Epode and Trochaic, p.* 7. What he means by ſaying that this had been obſerv'd *even* by ſome of the Ancients, is not eaſie to apprehend, nor why he quotes *Chryſoſtome* for it, whoſe Authority either in this, or any other caſe, is

not

not very conſiderable; and who beſides, does not ſay that for which he's produc'd; eſpecially when there is an approved Writer more ancient than *Dion*, that has directly ſaid that for which *Dion* is improperly brought. *Dion*, in the Oration quoted, after a tedious inſipid Exordium about the different talents of praiſing and diſpraiſing, takes occaſion from thence to mention *Homer* as the famous Parent of *Panegyrick*, as *Archilochus* was of *Satyr*, and prefers 'em to all others in their way. But he has not a word there about *the Oldeſt Books being the beſt in their kind*, or *of the Double Glory of inventing and perfecting*; for which Dr. *Bentley* gravely produces him. But tho' *Dion* ſays nothing of this, *Velleius Paterculus* does: *Non quenquam alium* (ſays he) *cujus operis primus Auctor fuerit, in eo perfectiſſimum reperiemus prater Homerum & Archilochum. Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 5. 'Tis a little odd, methinks, that Dr. *Bentley*, who profeſſes in this Piece of his to give Battel to Sophiſts and Sophiſtry, and to decry 'em as a company of illiterate Scribblers, ſhould yet think fit to grace the very Entrance of his Work, with vouching the Authority of as errant a Sophiſt and Declaimer as ever was; and with vouching him for what he really did not ſay: and for what had been ſaid by a much better hand, before him. But great Scholars have very particular ways with 'em.

Dr. *Bentley* goes on: *But the choice of* Phalaris *and* Æſop, *as they are now extant, for the two great and inimitable Originals, is a piece of Criticiſm of a Peculiar Complexion, and muſt proceed*

ceed from a ſingularity of Palate and Judgment.

For *Æſop* it will be time enough to account when I come to the entire Diſſertation that concerns him. But as to *Phalaris's Epiſtles*, many learned men of different Ages and Countries, have been profeſs'd admirers of 'em; never any man, till the Judicious Dr. *Bentley* aroſe, pretended to deſpiſe 'em: even thoſe Criticks of late days, who ſuſpected their being Genuine, yet allow'd 'em to be finiſh'd things in their way, and excellently well counterfeited. And therefore the value which Sir *W. Temple* profeſſes for 'em cannot be ſaid to proceed from a *Singularity of Palate and Judgment*: at leaſt this ought not to be ſaid by him, who but four Pages afterwards lets us know, that *Stobæus* eſteem'd 'em ſo highly, as to inſert ſome of 'em into his Judicious Collections; and that *Suidas* terms 'em *Ἐπιστολὰς θαυμασίας λίαν*, *moſt admirable Letters.* Sir *W. Temple*, one would have thought, might have been ſecured from the imputation of Singularity by the concurring Judgments of two ſuch men, for whom, we may be ſure, Dr. *Bentley* on any other occaſion would have had a particular regard: the one an eminent Commonplacer, and the other a no leſs eminent Dictionary-writer. 'Tis a pleaſant Reflexion to conſider that Dr. *Bentley*, at the ſame time that he is paſſing this free Cenſure on Sir *W. Temple*'s Palate, is himſelf advancing an Opinion contrary to the ſenſe of all Mankind that had ever written before him: Will not a modeſt Reader, on this occaſion,

casion, he apt to say, that both the *Criticism* and the *Critic* too are of a *Peculiar Complexion*?

He forgets, I believe, when and where a certain Critic of our times maintain'd, that *Ovid* and *Manilius*, were the only two Poets that had *wit* among the Ancients. A very extraordinary piece of Criticism! and which, doubtless, proceeded not from any *singularity of Palate and Judgment!* 'Tis just as if I should say, that Sir *W. Temple* and Dr. *Bentley* are the two best-bred Writers living; or, to put it into the Dr's more learned and polite way, That *Nireus* and *Thersites* were the only two *formosi men that repair'd to the Siege of* Ilium. *Manilius* writes with just as much *wit* as Dr. *Bentley* does with *modesty*: only the difference is, that *Manilius*'s subject would not admit of *wit*, and therefore he might have it, for ought we know, tho' he did not show it; whereas Dr. *Bentley*'s subject, (which is generally *Himself*) does not only admit of *modesty*, but require it.

The rest of Dr. *Bentley*'s Preamble is taken up in giving us an account how spurious Books came to prevail upon the World. He says, *That they appeared almost as old as Letters; but that they were then confin'd, when the Kings of* Pergamus *and* Alexandria, *rivalling one another in the Magnificence and Copiousness of their Libraries, gave great Rates for any Treatises that carried the names of Celebrated Authors*; and this he proves out of *Galen* upon *Hippocrates, de Natura Hominis*.

There

There are other Old Writers that tell this Story, and tell it more truly, than *Galen* did, tho' a Native of *Pergamus*. He positively affirms, in favour of the Point he is proving, that till the time of these Rival Princes, there was no such thing as a spurious Book in the World; which is neither true, nor agreeable to what Dr. *Bentley* tells us in the case, that *the Practice of forging Books was almost as Old as Letters*. Here therefore, as before in the case of *Paterculus*, Dr. *Bentley* should have contented himself with vouching apposite, tho' common Authorities; and not have gone out of his way to have fetch'd in a witness, that, after all, speaks against him. But he loves to surprize and dazle his Reader: for who would expect to see a point of History setl'd out of a Physician?

I thought indeed Quotation had been the Dr's peculiar Province; and that either he could manage that to advantage, or nothing. But these two awkward Proofs out of *Dion Chrysostome* and *Galen* (the very first he has produc'd) have shook my opinion of him even in this Respect. As we go further, we shall see clearlier what to judge of him.

I will detain the Reader no longer in the Approaches to our Argument, than till I have desir'd him to joyn with me in his thanks to Dr. *Bentley*, for the Intimation he has given us of a certain Supplement to *Petronius* found at *Buda*. He does not, I suppose, mean that from *Alba Graca*, which any of his Dictionaries would have told him was Latin, not for *Buda*, but *Belgrade*: and therefore

fore I conclude, that this must be some new discovery, which Dr. *Bentley* has had earlier notice of, than the rest of the Learned World; and that in time he will oblige us with a further account of it.

DR. *Bentley* having declar'd open War against *Phalaris*, and all his Party, and having in his own Opinion gain'd the Victory, thought that the more Captive Criticks there were to follow his Chariot-wheels, the more glorious would his Triumph be: He begins therefore with giving us an account of the Number and Strength of the Enemy he engages. He tells us, that the Epistles have been admitted as Genuine, ever since *Stobæus*'s time; that He has quoted 'em thrice: that *Suidas* speaks of 'em with honour; and, that *Tzetzes* has made large Extracts out of 'em. *These three, I think*, says he, *are the only Men among the Ancients that make any mention of 'em.* (a)

(a) P. 21.

They are perhaps the *only Ancients*, whose testimonies are to be met with, in any of the Prefaces to *Phalaris*: but Dr. *Bentley* methinks should have dug deeper for his materials, and consulted Original Authors. Had he done so, he might have found, that they are mention'd too by (b) *Photius* in his Epistles, that they are quoted by *Nonnus* (c) in his Historical Comment on St. *Gregory*'s *Invectives*, and by the (d) *Scholiast* on *Aristophanes*; that very

(b) Epist. 207.

(c) ὡς δὲ αὐτὸς ὁ Φάλαρις ἐν ὁπωσοῦν ἐπιστολῇ φησὶ &c. p. 144.

(d) Plut. vers. 142. Καὶ ὁ Φάλαρις — οἱ βέλτιστοι ἡμᾶς κλαύσεται πάντες.

Scho-

Scholiast, whom, one would think, the Dr. by his citing him so often (*e*), had thoroughly read. The Latest of these is some Centuries older than either *Suidas* or *Tzetzes*. Indeed *Tzetzes*, who liv'd but in the 12th Century, deserves not to be call'd an *Ancient*; and Dr. *Bentley* himself is of this mind in another part of his Dissertation (*f*), where he stiles him *a Later Greek*. But it was convenient, that he should be an Ancient here, and a Modern there, in order to the different Ends which Dr. *Bentley* had to serve by him.

(*e*) P. 100, 117, 118, 119, 127, 140, 148, &c.

(*f*) P. 53.

Besides these, there is another remarkable Quotation from the Epistles in *Stobæus*, which Dr. *Bentley* has overlook'd; 'tis *Tit.* CCXVIII: where an entire Epistle of *Phalaris* is transcrib'd, as it is again in the Collection of *Antonius* and *Maximus* the Monks, which accompanies *Stobæus*. Had Dr. *Bentley* had these Authorities in his view, he might with better Grounds, tho' not with more Assurance, have pronounc'd, that * The Epistles *have the general Warrant and Certificate for this last thousand years, before the Restoration of Learning.* And thus far I can agree with him: but when he further assures us, that † *All the Scholars of those Ages receiv'd 'em for true Originals*; as willing as I am to hear any thing in *Phalaris*'s favour, I must beg leave to dissent from him; because I find One of those I mention'd, (and Him a Scholar, I think, if there were any in the Age in which he liv'd) speaking of 'em with some distrust: 'Tis *Photius* I mean; who gives 'em indeed an extraordinary character, and prefers 'em to

* P. 11.

† P. 16. & 11.

the

the Epistles of *Plato*, *Aristotle*, and *Demosthenes*: but withal intimates his Suspicions that they are not Genuine, when he calls 'em the * *Epistles that are attributed to* Phalaris, and joyns 'em with those that (as he speaks) *are ascrib'd to* † Brutus.

* Ep. 207. Τας εις Φαλαριν αναφερομενας Επιστολας.
† Ib. ας Βρουτος ενεγραψεν.

With these Ancients, he tells us, many Moderns have concurr'd in Opinion; particularly, that *Faxelius* and *Jacobus Capellus*, two very Learned men, have asserted the credit of the Epistles; and that *Selden* himself depended on 'em so much, as to determine a point of Chronology out of 'em. And now what would a Modest man expect shou'd have been Dr. *Bentley*'s end in reckoning up all these great Mens Opinions, but to strengthen and countenance his Own? whereas he brings 'em in, only to shew how impossible it was for them to judge right, who had the misfortune to live before him. In spite of what the Learned men of so many Ages and Nations have thought and said, Dr. *Bentley knows* (a), and will *demonstrate* (b), *Phalaris*'s Epistles *to be spurious*: Nay, *he is very much mistaken*, he says, *in the nature and force of his Proofs, if ever any man hereafter, that reads 'em, persist in his Old Opinion of making* Phalaris *an Author* (c). I will own to the Reader, that had these words offer'd themselves to me before I had been acquainted with Dr. *Bentley*'s Manner, they would have given me some uneasiness. *Phalaris* was always a Favourite-book with me; from the moment I knew it, I wish'd it might prove an Original: I had now and then indeed some suspicions that 'twas not Genuine; but I lov'd him so much more

(a) P. 64.
(b) P. 5.
(c) P. 13.

more than I ſuſpected him, that I wou'd not ſuffer my ſelf to dwell long upon 'em. To be ſincere, The Opinion, or Miſtake if you will, was ſo pleaſing, that I was ſomewhat afraid of being undeceiv'd. However, I ventur'd to try, whether the Dr's Proofs would overbear me with that weight of Demonſtration they threatned. I read 'em, I weigh'd 'em; and I found, to my ſatisfaction, that *Phalaris* might ſtill be an Author, notwithſtanding what Dr. *Bentley* had ſaid againſt him. Nay, I aſſure the Reader, that my Doubts about the Authority of the Epiſtles, ſince I read Dr. *Bentley*'s Diſſertation, are much leſſen'd; and if he ſhould write once more upon the Subject, perhaps the point would be clear to me.

His *Arguments* againſt the Epiſtles (they are to go for ſuch, till I have prov'd 'em not to be Arguments) when taken out of the Confuſion with which he has deliver'd 'em, may be diſtinguiſh'd into ſuch, as affect the *whole*, or touch only thoſe *Particular Epiſtles* from whence they are drawn. The firſt of theſe are of greateſt conſequence; for if any One of 'em holds, the Authority of the Epiſtles is in danger: and I ſhall therefore, with Dr. *Bentley*'s leave, conſider 'em in the firſt place. In order to come at any of theſe, I muſt overlook a great many of his Pages for the preſent; not without intentions of returning to 'em: for he has advanc'd nothing on this Subject, but what ſhall, in its proper Time and Place, have a thorough Examination.

The Firſt of theſe *General Proofs*, that I meet with, (for I ſhall take 'em as they lye) is in the 12th Paragraph, where the Dr. objects

againſt the *Dialect Phalaris* uſes; who reigning in *Sicily*, and being, as he tells us (*a*), born there, ſhould have ſpoken *Doric*, the prevailing Language of the Iſland; whereas he writes *Attic, the beloved Dialect of the Sophiſts, in which they affected to excell one another even to Pedantry and Solaciſm* (*b*).

(*a*) P. 44.

(*b*) P. 41.

Tho' it be no very material point, yet I cannot grant the Dr. that the Language of theſe Letters is properly Attic. There are indeed ſeveral Attic ways of ſpeech in 'em; but ſo there are in other Authors, who confeſſedly wrote in the Common Dialect. 'Tis one thing to mix Atticiſms in ones ſtyle, and another thing ſtrictly to write Attic; *Homer* did the one, *Thucydides* and *Plato* the other: however no body will ſay, that *Homer* wrote in the ſame Dialect with *Thucydides* and *Plato*. Dr. *Bentley* has abundance of pure *Angliciſms* in his Latin, and *Latiniſms* in his Engliſh; but he will not for all that be willing to allow, either that his Diſſertation on *Malala* is in Engliſh, or that this on *Phalaris* is in Latin.

Well, but ſuppoſing the Letters to be in Attic, what uſe does he make of this? why, he argues from hence, that they were written by the Sophiſts; *who*, he tells us, *affected to excell one another in writing Attic, even to Pedantry and Solaciſm* (*c*). A very deep Reflection! ſo deep, that I muſt confeſs my ſelf to be a little at a loſs for the Meaning of it. The peruſal of a Late Author indeed has given me a clear Notion what it is to be *affected even to Pedantry*, but the being affected *even to Solaciſm*, and in *Attic* too, is to Me, I confeſs, a very incomprehenſible degree of

(*c*) P. 41.

Af-

Affectation. I thought, the *Athenians*, of all the *Greeks*, ſpoke the moſt Properly, and Purely; and were the furtheſt remov'd from any ſuſpicion of *Soleciſm:* and that therefore no one could be guilty of it, *while* he ſpake as They ſpake; any more than a Man can ſtick ſtrictly to the Language of the Court, and yet ſpeak falſe Engliſh. But Dr. *Bentley*'s Notions of Language differ much from mine; and therefore 'tis no wonder if I do not apprehend him.

To let his *Flouriſh* paſs then, and to come to his *Argument*; I will venture to ſay, that it is *a ſilly one:* and I make thus free with it, becauſe it is *my Own*, and mention'd by Me, in my Preface to *Phalaris* *, as one of the Grounds I had to ſuſpect the Authority of the Epiſtles; tho' I was far, even then, from having that high Opinion of it Dr. *Bentley* has, or thinking it to be Demonſtrative Evidence: and the more I conſider it, the leſs Weight I find in it.

* *Neq; cum Siculis Scriptoribus placueris ſemper Dialectum Dorica, Agrigentinorum (qui antiquitus Dores erant) Tyrannus alia uti debuit.* p. 21.

For *Phalaris* was by no means oblig'd to ſpeak *Doric*, on the account of his being *a Sicilian born*; for two good Reaſons: becauſe the Natives of *Sicily* (and ſo of other places) did not always write in the prevailing Dialect of their Country; and becauſe *Phalaris* was no Native of *Sicily*. I ſhall diſpatch this Laſt point firſt, becauſe it will give us the leaſt Trouble.

If the Credit of the Letters ſtands good, *Phalaris*, we are ſure, was no *Sicilian*; Dr. *Bently* indeed ſays he was, and threatens to

† P. 44. prove it from Good Authors† : but threatn'd Hiſtory, as well as other threatn'd things, has the luck ſometimes to live long; and ſo it has happen'd in the preſent point: for the Dr. notwithſtanding his Menaces, has not, throughout his Diſſertation, ſaid a Syllable to ſhake it.

I can help the Dr. indeed to One Author, that ſpeaks ſomething to his purpoſe; and Him an Old Scholiaſt too, which will pleaſe the Dr. the better: *Nonnus* (*a*) ſays, that *Phalaris* was by birth a *Sicilian*; but he gives this, together with ſome other Impertinent and Ridiculous Accounts of him, which he there confutes. This is all I can at preſent do for the Dr. in the matter; and as little as it is, it is more than the Dr. has done for himſelf.

(*a*) In *Greg. Invect.* 1. 143.

But whether *Phalaris* were of *Sicily*, or no; the Dr. is poſitive (*b*), that he was not of *Aſtypalæa*, a City in *Crete*, as I have repreſented him. And upon this fancied miſtake of mine he is very merry, and throws out a great deal of awkward Drollery; which, had there been an Occaſion given for it, would, let me tell him, have but ill become a Man of his Gravity, and a Reader of Old Scholiaſts: but as it is founded purely on a Miſtake of his own, is ſomewhat the more unſeaſonable, and unbecoming. For, after the Dr's fit of Mirth is over, I would ask him ſeriouſly, how he comes to impute the Diſcovery of this new City in *Crete* to me? do not the Epiſtles them-

(*b*) Aſtypalæa, *a City in Crete, never mention'd before by any Geographer.* Diſſert. P. 44.

Our Diligent Editors made that Diſcovery in Geography; for it could not be learnt any where elſe. Diſſert. p. 58.

themſelves plainly ſuppoſe it? and does not he himſelf grow wiſe enough, or ſincere enough, by the 58th Page, expreſly to own that they do ſo; and ſave me the trouble of proving it? I have the ſame Authority to ſay that *Phalaris* was born at *Aſtypalæa* in *Crete*, as that he was born at any place of that Name. And what has the Dr. to oppoſe to it? why, he aſſures us, that there was no ſuch City in *Crete*. Has he then a Liſt of all the *Hundred Cities* there? if he has, 'tis a compleater one by far than *Ptolemy*'s; and a mightier Diſcovery in Geography, than that of mine, with which he ſo ingeniouſly diverts himſelf. He ſhould however have had ſome Wiſdom in his Mirth, and have look'd about him, before he reſolv'd to be poſitive. Had he done ſo, he would have found, that both *Goltzius* (*a*) and *Fazellus* (*b*) made this Diſcovery before me: the Laſt of theſe Dr. *Bentley* has vouchſaf'd to call *a very Learned Man* (*c*); and I'll venture to call the Other ſo. So that if I did miſtake, I miſtook after Great Names: and Dr. *Bentley* is unpardonable, for not knowing, or not owning, what One of theſe had ſaid; for he quotes (*d*) the very Page in *Fazellus*, where the Words I have produc'd from him are. If he had read it, as well as quoted it, he could not have miſs'd 'em; They ſtand ſo fairly in the Front of *Fazellus*'s ſhort account of *Phalaris*, that they muſt needs have ſtar'd him in the Face. I will not be ſo rude as to call the Dr. a

(*a*) Hiſt. Sicil. & Mag. Gr. ex Numiſm. *p.* 126. *Patre Cretenſis, Urbe Aſtypalide.*

(*b*) Rer. Sic. *Dec.* 1, *L.* 6, *C.* 1. *Phalaris* Cretâ Inſulâ *Urbe Aſtypalide ortus.*

(*c*) Differt. *p.* 12.

(*d*) Differt. *p.* 12.

Second-hand Critic; but the Reader may judge how far he has given me an occaſion to do it.

But *No Geographer*, he ſays, *has mention'd this City in* Crete *. He ſpeaks unwarily; I will ſuppoſe, he means, no *Old* one. No more have they ſeveral of the other *Ninety Nine*; which nevertheleſs were as ſurely there, as if half a dozen Geographers had given us the Names of them. It is enough for my purpoſe, that the Letters have mention'd this *Aſtypalea*. If Dr. *Bentley* will diſcard all Places, that occurr but once in Ancient Writers, he'l make mad Work in Geography. What does he think of *Trinacia*, the *Sicilian* Town in *Diodorus*? what of the Καλὸς λιμὴν mention'd by *Scylax*? where elſe does he meet with 'em? He'll ſay, they are corrupt Readings, perhaps: but the MSS. agree in 'em. No matter for that! while the MSS. are for Him, he is for Them; and no longer. And, therefore to ſhorten the Work, and ſave my ſelf, and the Reader, the trouble of more Inſtances, I'll put the Dr. in mind of what the Learned *Palmerius* ſays upon this place in *Scylax*: *Ejus Loci ſeu Regiunculæ* (ſays he) *alibi quod ſciam non fit mentio. Sed ideò fortè non eſt exterminanda ex hoc loco Vox. Nam quot Loca, quot Regiuncula fuerunt, quarum Authores, qui ad nos uſq; devenerunt, vel ſemel, vel nunquam fecerunt mentionem?* Does the Dr. think, becauſe *Aſtypalea* was an *Iſland* among the *Cyclades*, and among the *Sporades*, that therefore it could not be a *Town* any where elſe? Is not this juſt the Caſe of *Naxos*, which was an Iſle among the *Cyclades*; and yet

* Diſſ. p. 44

yet a Town in *Crete*, and in *Sicily* too? *Strabo* mentions *Aſtypalæa* a Promontory in *Attica*, another Promontory of that name in *Caria*; a third *Aſtypalæa*, the ancient Metropolis of the Iſland *Cos*: and why might there not be an *Aſtypalæa* in *Crete* too?

I have dwelt too long on this point; however I cannot yet part with it, till I have done right to the Learned *Greek Profeſſor of Cambridge*; whom Dr. *Bentley* takes upon him to correct, without the leaſt Ground or Colour of Reaſon: to ſhew, I ſuppoſe, that he was Impartial, and reſolv'd to beſtow his Good Manners, as he had done Himſelf, upon Both Univerſities.

Dr. *Barnes* would have the Iſland *Aſtypalæa*, where he ſuppoſes *Phalaris* born, to be that among the *Cyclades*. Dr. *Bentley* allowing *Phalaris* to have been born in the Iſland *Aſtypalæa*, yet ſays it muſt be that among the *Sporades*; for this convincing Reaſon; *becauſe this Latter was neareſt to* Crete, *whither* Phalaris's *Wife and Son are ſuppoſ'd to have fled.* Ep. LXIX *. Giving the Dr. Leave to ſuppoſe this *Flight* from *Aſtypalæa* to *Crete*, why muſt it needs be from the *Aſtypalæa* that was neareſt? Thoſe that fly are uſually glad to get as far as they can out of the reach of their Purſuers. But now even the Flight, upon the Suppoſition of which this fine Reaſoning turns, is it ſelf a Fiction. For neither in that Epiſtle which the Dr. quotes for this, nor in any other Epiſtle, is any ſuch Flight mention'd, or ſuppos'd, or in the leaſt intimated. Was it worth his while to forge this little Piece of Hiſtory, only in order to contradict his Bet-

* P. 44.

ters? Is the Pleaſure of inventing a Circumſtance, meerly to be rude with, an Equivalent to the Shame of being told on't?

But he has found the Profeſſor in another Miſtake, as Material as This, and as well made out. Dr. *Barnes* had call'd the Iſland, *Aſtypala*, and not *Aſtypalæa*; and the Exact Dr. *Bentley* therefore is ſo kind, as to inform him how it ſhould be ſpelt. A little ſhare of Good Nature would have made the Dr. ſuſpect an Error of the Preſs in this caſe, if there had been any Error; and a little more Reading than he has, would have tanght him, that there was no Error in it: for the Profeſſor call'd the Iſland but as *Scylax* (*a*) had call'd it before him. On both theſe accounts, the Dr. might have ſpar'd his Criticiſm: and ſo he would probably, but that Mr. Profeſſor had been guilty of a Fault not to be forgiven by *Gratuitouſly undertaking to Apologize for the Epiſtles of* Phalaris (*b*), in his Elaborate Edition of *Euripides*: that is, (for I can make no other ſenſe of it) by defending the Authority of the Epiſtles, *without having any thing for his Pains*. This looks as if the Dr. thought Learned Men were to ſet a Price upon their Civilities, and never part with a Favour till they had their Fee.

(*a*) Ἀσυπάλη.

(*b*) Differ. *P.* 44.

But to return from our Digreſſion; Let us allow the Dr. what he contends for, without any manner of Proof or Reaſon, that *Phalaris* was a *Sicilian born*: will he inferr from hence, that it was neceſſary for him to write in *Doric*? That I can never allow him. For we have Inſtances without Number, of Authors writing in a Dialect different from that

of

of their own Country; and not a few Inſtances of *Sicilian* Writers, who laid aſide the *Doric*: and why then ſhould *Phalaris*, a Prince, and a very Arbitrary and Lawleſs one, be confin'd to it? *Agathyrſides*, the Hiſtorian of *Samos*, had he follow'd the Dialect of his Country, would have written in *Doric*; and *Chryſermus* of *Corinth*, in *Doric*: and yet both of 'em writ in the Common Dialect, as appears by the Extracts out of 'em, preſerv'd in *Stobæus*. So did *Andronicus* the *Rhodian*, who paraphras'd ſome part of *Ariſtotle*, and *Dionyſius* the *Halicarnaſſian*; tho' both *Rhodes* and *Halicarnaſſ* were Cities of *Dorian* Original. *Herodotus* was of the ſame place with *Dionyſius*, and yet made the *Ionic* Dialect his choice; as *Hippocrates* of *Cos*, a *Dorian* Town alſo, had done before him. *Rhianus*, and *Epimenides* were both *Cretans*: that the Firſt of theſe wrote not in the particular Dialect of *Crete*, we are as ſure, as that the large Fragment aſcrib'd to him is his; that the Latter did not, we have reaſon to think from the ſhort Citation out of him in St. *Paul* (*a*), where we find the Common word ἀεὶ imploy'd inſtead of αἰὲν, which the Grammarians tell us (*b*) was peculiar to the Inhabitants of that Iſland. *Alcæus*, *Sappho*, and *Simonides*, were born in places where the Ionic was ſpoken, and yet wrote their Lyric Poems in Æolic, or Doric. Dr. *Bentley* indeed pretends in ſome meaſure to account for this by ſaying, that the *Lyric* (or, as He loves to ſpeak, the *Melic*) Poets choſe the Do-

(*a*) Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί.

(*b*) *Fob. Philop. Corinthus*, } *de Dialectis.*

Doric Dialect for the ſake of the Doric Harmony, which was fitted to That, and to the Nature of the Ode: but why then did not the reſt of the Lyric Writers chuſe it too? It would have become *Anacreon*'s Odes, every whit as well as *Sappho*'s; and *Archilochus*'s, as well as either: and yet both *Anacreon* and *Archilochus* wrote in Ionic. So that no ſure Rule can be fix'd, or holding Reaſon given, for the Ancient Writers departing from the Idiom of their Country: Hiſtorians, Moraliſts, Philoſophers, and Poets of all ſorts practis'd it at pleaſure; chuſing ſuch a Dialect, as either pleas'd their Own Ear, or the Ears of thoſe for whoſe ſake they wrote, and whom they endeavour'd to pleaſe (*a*); or ſuch, as they thought ſuited beſt with their Subject: and very often they took up with that Dialect, which was in Faſhion among the Polite Writers of the Age in which they liv'd. For, that there was a *Faſhion* in Dialects, and that the Chief of 'em had ſeverally their Courſe and Period, in which they flouriſh'd, may (not to mention other Proofs of it) be gather'd from a Paſſage in *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus*; where he ſays of the Old *Greek* Authors, that *they choſe the Ionic Dialect to write in, as being that which was moſt in Vogue in their time* (*b*). I propoſe this only as *probable*, Dr. *Bentley* would

(*a*) This probably was the Caſe of *Callimachus*, in his Hymn upon the Baths of *Pallas*, compos'd by him in Doric, to compliment the *Argians* (or *Argitæi*, as Dr. *Bentley* new names 'em, p. 82): tho' the ſame reaſon will not hold for his Other Doric Hymn, dedicated to the honour of *Ceres*: nor can any reaſon be given for it, but what will equally prove, that he ought to have written the reſt of his Hymns in Doric.

(*b*) Οἱ τὰ τὴν τότε νέαν ἀκμάσαντα μάλιστα ἐπιλεξάμενοι. D. H. in Thucyd.

would have ſaid it was *demonſtrable*. But no man ſhould be Dogmatical in Caſes of this Nature, where ſeveral other Circumſtances, beſide the vaſt diſtance of Time, concurr to make the Subject obſcure; where all is but a Lucky Gueſs, and He that is moſt Learned muſt, if he be fair, confeſs, that he has but a very dim and uncertain Light to ſee by.

It will then be very hard upon our *Sicilian* Prince, to deny him a Liberty, which Writers of all ſorts, and of all other Countries and Times have taken: and it will be harder ſtill, if we conſider, that this is what has been done often even by *Sicilians* themſelves. *Diodorus* and *Empedocles* are famous Inſtances of this kind; the One, in Proſe; and the Other, in Verſe: *Archimedes* the *Syracuſan*'s Works do not all equally partake of the Doric Idiom; ſome have more, and ſome have leſs of it, as they were written ſooner or later; and his Treatiſe of *the Sphere and Cylinder*, the moſt remarkable part of his Works, leaſt of all.

To come yet cloſer to our point: We have a Letter writ by *Dion* of *Syracuſe* to *Dionyſius* Tyrant of that place, and part of another written by *Dionyſius* himſelf; both preſerv'd among the Epiſtles of *Plato*; where there is not the leaſt Shadow of Doriciſm: but as well the Prince as the Philoſopher have *written their Epiſtles in ſuch a Dialect, as if* (to uſe Dr. *Bentley*'s Gentlemanly Phraſe) *they had gone to School at* Athens *.

* Diſſ. p. 43.

Nay ſome of the Princes and States of *Sicily*, and other Dorian Countries, have caus'd *Coins* to be ſtruck, whoſe Inſcriptions are not in

in pure Doric. [Abundance of Instances of this kind are to be met with in *Goltzius*, *Pasuta*, and *Hardouin*: I shall give the Reader a Taste of them in the Margin *.

* Διονυσ. βασιλίως. Ἱερωνύμε βασιλίως. Συνάρχες ἱερᾶ ἀγῶνος, a *Cretan* mony; in some other Inscriptions it is Συνάρχας. Ὕλλι, the Inscription of a Coin, belonging to *Velia*, a Town in *Magna Græcia*.

Welia

But the most remarkable Instance of all is that of *Zaleucus*, King of the *Locrians*, a Doric Colony; the Preface to whose Laws is preserv'd in *Stobæus*, an exact and faithful Copier of Old Authors; and has plainly nothing of the Doric Dialect in it. *Diodorus Siculus*, who does not so strictly transcribe, but chuses rather to weave things into the Phrase and Body of his History, has the same Preface, with some Alterations; but none, that make it more Doric than it is in *Stobæus*.

And now, upon a View of these Instances, (and others of this kind, which I could produce; but I spare the Reader) I might bespeak the Dr. in his own pert way of Enquiry; *Pray, how came Attic* (or any other Dialect but the Doric) *to be the Court-Language at* Syracuse? *How came* Zaleucus, *and* Dionysius *the Tyrant, so to doat on the Dialect of a Democracy* (a)? How is it that those Little Princes of *Sicily*, as Arbitrary and Jealous of their Prerogative as the Mightiest Monarch whatever, allow'd of Inscriptions on their Coins, which were not in the Language of their Country? Any clear Solution that he shall please to afford us of these matters will equally serve to give us an account, why *Phala-*

(a) Differ. p. 41.

ris

ris too might be excus'd from writing in Doric.

Dr. *Bentley* has endeavour'd to prevent me in ſome part of the Evidence that I have brought; and has excepted againſt ſuch Inſtances as thoſe of *Empedocles*, and *Diodorus*, *whoſe Caſe*, he ſays, *is widely remote from that of our Tyrant. The former being to write an* EPIC POEM, *ſhew'd an excellent Judgment in laying aſide his Country Dialect for that of the Ionians; for the Doric Idiom had not Grace and Majeſty enough for the Subject he was engag'd in; being proper indeed for Mimes, Comedies, and Paſtorals, where Men of Ordinary Rank are repreſented, &c. but not to be us'd in* HEROIC, *without great diſadvantage* (*a*).

(*a*) Differ p. 49.

I deſire Dr. *Bentley* to inform me, in what Old Scholiaſt, or Manuſcript Author, he has met with this Curious account of *Empedocles*'s writing an *Epic Poem*: as much out of the way as he loves to read, he'll be hard put to it, I believe, to find an Authority for it. If he can, 'tis plain he knows more of *Empedocles*'s Works than *Laertius* did; who has been ſo abſurd, as to inform us particularly of ſeveral leſs conſiderable Pieces of his, and to paſs over altogether in ſilence this *Epic Poem*. Dr. *Bentley* will be pleas'd, at his leiſure, to produce his Vouchers in this point; which I am apt to believe he will do, at the ſame time that he lets us know where the *Buda MS. of Petronius* is to be met with. *Empedocles* wrote many things in Hexameters indeed; but Dr. *Bentley* ſure cannot be ſo wretchedly ignorant as to think, that every Large Copy of Verſes written in Hexameters, is an *Epic Poem*.

Ari-

Aristotle would have inform'd him, that *Empedocles* was so far from being an *Epic Poet*, a Poet of the first Rank, that he scarce deserv'd the Name of a Poet at large: Ὅμηρον (says he) καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλέα τῷ μέτρῳ, εἰ δοκεῖ, συνάπτειν δίκαιον εἶναι· διὸ τὸν μὲν ποιητὴν δίκαιον καλεῖν, τὸν δὲ φυσιολόγον μᾶλλον ἢ ποιητήν. (a) *There is nothing that* Homer *and* Empedocles *agree in but their Verse; and therefore* Homer *indeed may justly be call'd a Poet, but* Empedocles *rather a Naturalist, than a Poet.* Or if *Aristotle* be too good a Book for Dr. *Bentley* to converse with, there is a Writer of less size, even his Friend Mr. *Wotton*, who would have taught him the Distinction between *Philosophical* and *Epical Poems*; that is, such as *Empedocles* and *Lucretius* wrote on the one side, and *Homer* and *Virgil* on the other. He who is so nicely severe upon *Phalaris*, for confounding μῦθος and ἱστορία (b), should have taken care not to have given *Phalaris*'s Friends an Opportunity of making Reprisals. The Fatal Mistake in this case was, that *Suidas*, the Dr's Oracle, calls him ἐποποιός, which strictly taken, signifies an *Epic Poet*, but in its loose sense a *Versifier* only; and the Dr. was not at leisure to take notice of this distinction.

(a) Poet. c. 1.

Comp. of anc. and mod. Lear. P. 32.

(b) Disser. p. 59.

And if *Empedocles* did not write an *Epic Poem*, how did he *shew his Judgment in laying aside his Country Dialect?* Could not *Physics* have been as *Judiciously* wrote in Doric *Verse*, by *Him*, as in Doric *Prose* by *Ocellus Lucanus*, and the rest of the *Pythagoreans?* His Treatise of *Expiations* (c), why would it not have born being written in Doric, as well as *Theocritus*'s

(c) Καθαρμοί.

tus's *Pharmaceutria?* eſpecially ſince *Laertius* intimates, that the Subject of that Treatiſe was in great meaſure drawn from the *Pythagoreans:* would it not properly then have been compos'd in the Dialect thoſe Philoſophers us'd? We have ſeveral ſmall Remains of *Empedocles*; but not a Line of his in Doric. We have a Large Fragment of his, directed to the People of *Agrigent*, his Townſmen: did he *ſhew his Judgment in laying aſide his Country Dialect* there too, when he was directing his Verſes to the very People of his Country? Had *the Doric Idiom not Grace and Majeſty enough for the Subject he was engag'd in*, when the Subject was no higher than an Account of Himſelf to his own Countrymen? If Doric be *proper for Mimes, Comedies, and Paſtorals, where Men of ordinary Rank are repreſented*, why is it not as proper for little Poems, where Men of ordinary Rank are addreſs'd to? I believe it would puzzle a Man of leſs Sagacity than Dr. *Bentley*, to tell us, for what reaſon *Empedocles* us'd Ionic, but becauſe he had a mind to't: and may not the ſame reaſon be urg'd alſo in behalf of the Attic of *Phalaris?*

Dr. *Bentley* has had very ill Luck in bringing off the *Poet*, let us ſee whether he has better in what he has to ſay for the *Hiſtorian.* * *Diodorus Siculus*, he tells us, *and the other Hiſtorians of Dorian Nations, had great reaſon to decline the Uſe of their Vernacular Tongue, as improper for Hiſtory; which beſides the affectation of Eloquence, aims at Eaſineſs and Perſpicuity, and is deſign'd for General Uſe: but the Doric is Courſe and Ruſtic, and always clouded with an Obſcurity.* * P. 50.

The

The Reader cannot but obſerve in this Paſſage the particular Beauty and Happineſs of the Dr's Expreſſion: but it matters not much how he Writes, let us conſider how he Reaſons.

If the Dr's Solution be juſt, how came *Archimedes* and the *Pythagorean Naturaliſts* and *Moraliſts* not to *decline the uſe of their Vernacular Tongue*, as well as the *Hiſtorians*? They all, I dare ſay, aim'd as much at *Perſpicuity*, and the Laſt of the Three doubtleſs deſign'd their Treatiſes as much for *General Uſe*. I will not ſay indeed, that they *affected Eloquence*, becauſe I do not think that a good Character, whatever Dr. *Bentley* may: but, which is much better, they *were* Eloquent; very Lofty and Magnificent, and withal very Clear in their Expreſſion: on both which accounts they are recommended by *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus* *, to be read by all thoſe that deſire to write well. And his Judgment in this Caſe is the more to be valu'd, becauſe he wrote excellently well himſelf, and with great Perſpicuity.

* Μεγαλοπρεπὴς γὰρ τῇ λέξει, καὶ πυκνὸς, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐνδεὴς σαφηνείας. T. 1. p. 70.

'Tis true, as the Doric Dialect grew out of Uſe and Requeſt, their Writings grew leſs Eaſie and Perſpicuous; and *Porphyry* had reaſon therefore to attribute the decay of the *Pythagorean* Sect to the Uſe, or rather to the Decay of that Dialect: but without diſpute the Doric, in its flouriſhing days, had the ſame degree of Clearneſs as the reſt; and the Philoſophers, that writ in it, deſign'd their Works to be of as General Uſe, and to laſt

as

as long, as thoſe of the Hiſtorians. So that Dr. *Bentley* has aſſign'd no Reaſons for the Hiſtorians not writing in Doric, but what will ſerve as well to prove, Others not to have writ in it, tho' we are ſure they did: a Way of arguing, worthy his Adventurous Pen! and which no body, I believe, will envy him the honour of!

Hitherto I have been proving againſt Dr. *Bentley*, (I hope not without ſucceſs) that *Phalaris* was under no obligation of writing Doric, tho' he had been *a Sicilian born*: much leſs was he oblig'd to write it, upon the account of his Living among the *Agrigentines*, or Reigning over them, as Dr. *Bentley* pretends. *He was a Publican* (ſays the Dr.) *or Collector of Taxes; could not that Perpetual Negoce and Converſe with the Dorians bring his Mouth to ſpeak a little broader* (*a*)? No doubt it *could*, and perhaps it *did*: but the Queſtion is, whether, notwithſtanding his learning Doric, he might not retain another Dialect with it; and ſpeak it, and write it occaſionally? But *would not He that aim'd at Monarchy, and for that reaſon deſign'd to be Popular, have quitted his Old Dialect for that of the place, and not by every word he ſpake make the Invidious Diſcovery of his being a Stranger*? The Dr. forgets, that every one of *Phalaris*'s Epiſtles were written *after* he was a Tyrant: He might, for ought we know, ſpeak Doric before he got into Power; but afterwards there was no need of courting the People, for he govern'd by *his Blew coats* *. And I think he could not have taken a more proper way of ſhewing his Tyrannical Temper, than by

(*a*) P. 46.

* P. 39.

throwing off the Language of the Country, and using a Foreign Dialect in all his Dispatches. *The Conqueror* did the same thing by Us, when he chang'd the Language of our Law; and he shew'd himself in nothing more a Conqueror, than by doing it.

But the Dr. has urg'd, that *Phalaris*, being such a Tyrant, would not probably have been *fond of the Language of a Democracy, that was eminently popular*, an *hater of Tyrants* (*a*). Was not Doric too the Language of the *Lacedemonians*? and did not they have Tyrants, as much as the *Athenians* themselves? At this rate, *Phalaris* could not have spoken any Dialect of the Greek Tongue, for every one of 'em was the Language of a Democracy, some where or other. If the Dr's Reasoning be right indeed, it may happen to prove that the Epistles are not Genuine, because not written in *Persic*; but it will never prove 'em Spurious, because they are not written in Doric. After all, what Trifles are these to amuse us with? that *Phalaris*, to be sure, would not speak Attic, because *the* Athenians *in his time drove out* Pisistratus? Would I give my self leave to declaim at this rate, might I not with much better colour say, that *Phalaris* would, to chuse, make use of that Dialect, because it was the Language of *Pisistratus*, his Brother Tyrant? I see Dr. *Bentley* loves no less to argue, than read out of the way; and it is so much out of the way, that I am asham'd to follow him.

(*a*) P. 41.

Were I so very a Critic, as to love Wrangling rather than Truth, I might further dispute it with the Dr. whether Doric were

the Language of *Agrigent*, or no, and that upon no leſs an Authority than *Strabo*'s; who expreſly ſays, that *Agrigent* was a Colony of the *Ionians* (*a*). And Monſieur *Menage* (*b*) rely'd upon this ſo far, as to account from hence for the Ionic of *Empedocles*. However, I muſt freely own my Opinion, that this Paſſage is corrupted, and that we ought to read Δωριεῦσιν inſtead of Ἰωσιν, according to the account which that moſt Exact and Faithful Writer *Thucydides* has given us; not to mention *Polybius*, and the *Scholiaſt* on *Pindar*. And this Conjecture is the more probable, becauſe *Strabo* ſeems to be ſpeaking there of Colonies drawn from one part of *Sicily* to another; ſuch as that from *Syracuſe* to *Camarina*, which he mentions in the words immediately foregoing. I wonder how this eſcap'd the moſt Learned and Acute *Caſaubon*'s obſervation. Not to inſiſt upon this therefore; but allowing Dr. *Bentley*, that *Agrigent* was a *Dorian* Town, as I believe it was; allowing him, that *Phalaris* was even born there, if he pleaſes, or in any other Town in *Sicily*, that he ſhall pitch upon, as I believe he was not: and allowing further, that *Phalaris* was oblig'd on this account to ſpeak Doric as long as he liv'd, yet ſtill I have One Queſtion to ask the Dr.; How can he prove, that *Phalaris* did not write Doric? 'Tis true, the Epiſtles at preſent are not in that Dialect: but they might have been Originally in it;

(*a*) Καυλονια δ' ἐστὶν Συρακουσίων, Ἀχαϊκῆς δὲ Ἰώνων. L. 6, p. 272.

(*b*) *Certè ut erat Agrigentum Ionum Colonia, teſte Strabone, Agrigentini licet Siculi (qui quidem Siculi Dores erant) Ionico ſermone forſan uterentur.* Notæ in Diog. Laert. l. 8, ſect. 60.

and afterwards, upon the diſuſe of that Dialect; *have been turn'd out of it into the Ordinary Language at the Fancy of ſome Copyer, before the Days of* Stobæus *. This the Dr. has irrefragably prov'd in the very Article we are upon, to have been the caſe of *Ocellus Lucanus*'s Book περὶ τῆς τῦ παντὸς φύσεως: and why may it not too have been the caſe of *Phalaris*'s Epiſtles? If ſome Copyer *ſince Stobæus*'s *time* thought that *Ocellus*'s *Phyſics* would look better out of Doric than in it, and therefore tranſdialected 'em; why might not ſome other Copyer *before Stobæus*'s *time* think the ſame of our Tyrants Letters, and do the ſame to 'em? and why, after this was done, might not the Original *Phalaris* be loſt, as well as the Original *Ocellus*? It is certain, that *Stobæus* thought that this might ſo happen; or at leaſt, that *Phalaris* might not have written Doric originally; for he tranſcribes ſeveral of his Epiſtles into his Excellent Work, in the very Language we now find 'em, without imagining in the leaſt that they could not be Genuine, becauſe they were not in Doric. Such a Conſequence as that never enter'd into his Head: He had met with ſeveral *Sicilian* Writers, that choſe to write out of the Dialect of their Country, particularly *Empedocles*, an Author of the ſame Town with *Phalaris*: (He had not indeed met with any *Heroic Poem* of his; that Lucky Hit was reſerv'd for the Inquiſitive Dr. *Bentley*) and he had met alſo with ſome Writers, whoſe works were at firſt in all probability penn'd in Doric, and yet were in another Dialect in his time: for inſtance, the Pieces of *Perillyone*, and

* P. 49.

Ari-

Ariſtoxenus, two *Pythagoreans*; and who very probably wrote Doric, becauſe they were *Pythagoreans*; and yet in *Stobæus*'s time it is plain, that ſome part of the Writings of the One were in Ionic, and thoſe of the Other (if I remember right; for I have not *Stobæus* now by me) in the Common Dialect. Let Dr. *Bentley* then take which ſide he pleaſes; either that *Perictyone*, and *Ariſtoxenus*, (and I will add *Zaleucus* too, who we are ſure was a *Pythagorean* alſo from very good Authority *) either, I ſay, that theſe *did* write originally in Doric, or that they *did not*. If they did, then we have Inſtances in 'em of Ancient Authors tranſdialected very early, long before the days of *Stobæus*; if they did not, then here is a plain Proof that Authors probably of Doric Countries (to be ſure One of 'em was) might nevertheleſs not write Doric: and either of theſe being granted me, the Reader ſees, there will be no difficulty in juſtifying the Dialect of *Phalaris*. Indeed if the Laſt be granted me, it will be pretty difficult to juſtifie Dr. *Bentley*'s hardy aſſertion, that *the* Pythagoreans *would ſooner have loſt their Lives, than have written out of Doric* (*b*); and that, if they had done it, *it is moſt certain they would have been baniſh'd the Society* (*c*). And therefore Dr. *Bentley*, I ſuppoſe, to make himſelf Conſiſtent, (a very hard Task!) will chooſe rather to grant, that theſe Writers were originally in Doric: and if they were, he will pleaſe to conſider, how they got out of it; and ſhew us, why *Phalaris* might not get out the very ſame way.

* *Porph.* in Vitâ *Pyth.* p. 15. *Diod. Sic.* l. 12, p. 84.

Jure

(*b*) Differ. P. 47.

(*c*) Ibid. p. 48.

And here I should take my leave of this tedious Article, but that I hear Dr. *Bentley* crying out Εὑρηκα, and calling loudly on the Learned World to listen to a mighty *Discovery*. He undertakes to prove, that Ocellus Lucanus *did not repudiate his Vernacular Idiom, nor compose his Book* [οὐ τὴν τῶ Πλήθει φίλον] *in the Dress that it now wears, but in his own Country fashion* *; that is, in plain English, that he did not write it in the Common Dialect, as 'tis now extant, but in Doric. Upon this the Dr. spreads his Plumes, and swells beyond his usual pitch: *I dare engage to make out*, and, *If I may expect Thanks for the Discovery*, are Expressions that carry in 'em an Extraordinary Air of Satisfaction; and seem a little too Pompous for the Matter they introduce, were it entirely New, and his Own; but they much less become it, considering it is all taken, Word for Word, out of a Preface to an Edition of *Ocellus*, as I shall now shew the Reader.

* Dissert. p. 47.

Vizzanius, above fifty Years ago, put out *Ocellus* †; and in his *Prolegomena* to that Piece has said every thing that Dr. *Bentley* has produc'd on this Subject, to a Tittle; and (which is a little unlucky) has said it almost in the very same Words too: only Dr. *Bentley* is in English (I compliment him when I say so) and *Vizzanius* is in Latin. The Dr. has condescended to translate that Honest Editor's Preface, without making the least Improvement of a single Argument there, but not without worsting several; and has the Modesty after that to take it All to Himself, as the First Inventor; and to talk higher of this

† *Bononiæ* 1646.

this *Petty Larciny* of his, than *Vizzanius* did of the Original Diſcovery, which he thought too Obvious to value himſelf upon. Perhaps ſome, who have not the Opportunity of comparing this Editor with Dr. *Bentley*, may be glad to have a Particular Account of the Dr's Ingenuity in the matter: and therefore I ſhall take the trouble of going through all he ſays on this point, and plainly ſhew whence he had his Intelligence.

I find (ſays the Dr. *) *it was agreed and covenanted among the Scholars of that Italian Sect,* φωνῇ ῥήσει τῇ πυθαγόρᾳ (Jambl. Vit. Pyth.) I can tell him, where he *found* it, it was in *Vizzanius*: who ſays the ſame thing, and quotes the very ſame Authority for it. *Id certè aſſerendum crediderim Ocellum Doricâ Dialecto ſuum Opus conſcripſiſſe, tùm quia Pythagoræos quoſlibet illi ſtuduiſſe comperio, tùm quia id Pythagoræ ſuadeant Inſtituta, cui ſemper Idiomatum Græcorum Doricum maximè voluit ſectari, tùm antiquius, tùm etiam præſtantius illud arbitratus teſte Jamblicho, in Vitâ Pythag.* Indeed he makes no ſuch Inference as Dr. *Bentley* does, *that the* Pythagoreans *would ſooner have loſt their Lives, than have broken this Agreement*; *and that 'tis moſt certain, if any body had publiſh'd a Book againſt that Injunction, he would have been baniſh'd the Society*: becauſe he knew, this was not obſerv'd by *Empedocles*, nor by the Author of the χρυσᾶ ἔπη, nor even by *Jamblichus*, while he is writing this Account of the *Pythagoreans*; no nor by *Pythagoras* himſelf, if *Diogenes Laertius* may be credited.

* Diſſert. p. 47.

'Tis true, *Vizzanius* ſpeaks a little unwarily, and may be underſtood to intimate, that the Uſe of this Dialect among the Italian Sect was from the inſtitution of *Pythagoras* himſelf: a Miſtake, which, if he were in, he was probably led into by too ſlight a peruſal of *Jamblichus*. Dr. *Bentley* took all he found there for his *Own*, and this Miſtake among the reſt; and when he had it, to make it look the more like his Own, gave it the Confident Turn. Immediately theſe *Inſtituta Pythagoræ* grew a ſolemn *Injunction of Pythagoras* (*a*), which the Dr. talks as familiarly of, as if he had ſeen a Copy of it. But methinks he might have inferr'd, that there was no Injunction of this kind, from what he himſelf had told us out of *Jamblichus* but Three Lines before; that this Uſe of the Dialect proceeded from *a Covenant and agreement among the Scholars* (*b*) themſelves: For they who know what an Implicit Regard was paid to *Pythagoras*'s *Orders* by all his Scholars, will eaſily agree, that there could be no need of their entring into a Compact, to do any thing that He had commanded. Dr. *Bentley*'s Adverſaries may be as ſevere upon him, on the account of his Criticiſms, as they pleaſe; but they needs muſt allow him to have a Particular Talent at Reaſoning, and to have thus much at leaſt of a Good Diſputant, that he is ſure to *make the moſt* of his Argument.

(*a*) P. 47.

(*b*) P. 47.

Dr. *Bentley*'s next Suggeſtion is this, *We are aſſur'd, that the other Pieces of this Author were made in Doric, as out of Lam, &c. Nhus, cited by* Stobæus. *Vizzanius* too cites this Fragment of *Ocellus*'s Piece *de Natura*, from *Stobæus*, and

and makes the ſame Uſe of it: *Ocellum ſcil. Lucanum ſcimus Librum de Legibus ſcripſiſſe — hujus fragmentum exhibet Stobæus — Doricâ Dialecto expreſſum*, &c.

Dr. *Bentley* goes on, *But, which is plain Demonſtration, Four Citations are brought by the ſame Writer out of this very Book,* ἐκ τῶν τῆ ταυτὶς φώνῃ, *all which are in Doric, and not as they are now extant in the Common Dialect. Vizzanius* referrs us to theſe four very places as they lye in *Stobæus*, and obſerves too that they are there in Doric; not, as they are now extant, in the Common Dialect. *De cæteris tandem in hoc Ocelli Opuſculo contentis quis dubitet? Si enim primum reſpiciamus Caput, textum ejuſdem ultimum; ſi ſecundum caput, textum ſextum; ſi tertium caput, poſtremam textûs quarti partem; & textum quintum & ſextum; iiſdem ſervatis vocibus, immutatâ licet Dialecto, ad amuſſim veluti Ocelli dogmata deſcribit Stobæus.*

From hence Dr. *Bentley* argues, that *this Tract of* Ocellus *now extant is to be acknowledg'd for a Genuine Work, which HITHERTO Learned Men have doubted of from this very buſineſs of the Dialect.* So does *Vizzanius* in the paſſage before quoted; and agen, *Grave Stobæi Teſtimonium, non perfunctorie, ſed ſummo ſtudio veteris monumenta ſapientiæ ſemper luſtrantis illud* [*Opus de Lege*] *ab Ocello prodiiſſe dubitare non ſinit; & tamen Dorico Idiomate videmus conſcriptum, cujus nec minima in hoc* [ἐκ τῶν τῆ ταυτὶς φώνῃ] *opere conſpiciuntur veſtigia: idcóq; an verè Ocellus aurcum hoc opus conſcripſerit, jure quicunque ſuſpicari contingat — hinc tamen certa potius quibus illi operi fides conciliatur, eruunt argumenta.* The only difference between *Vizzanius*

zanius and Dr. *Bentley* upon this point, is, that *Vizzanius* does not triumph over the miſtakes of thoſe that went before him, nor tell us that All the Learned Men before his time had doubted whether the Work were Genuine; even when he might perhaps have ſaid this ſafely, and truly: whereas Dr. *Bently* ſays it, fifty Years afterwards; and aſſures the World, that *HITHERTO Learned Men have doubted* of this matter, at the very time that he is a Tranſlating a Learned Man, who was ſo far from doubting of it, that he was giving Reaſons, why No body elſe ſhould ever doubt of it hereafter.

Dr. *Bentley* concludes his Whole Argument thus, *Now We ſee by theſe Fragments, that every Word of the True Book is faithfully preſerv'd; the Doric only being chang'd into the ordinary Language, at the Fancy of ſome Copyer, ſince the Days of* Stobæus. *Vizzanius* does not ſpeak quite ſo ſtrongly as the Dr, but he gives much the ſame account of it: *Quis dubitet de hoc Opuſculo, cum videris eoſdem quos retulit Stobæus textus iiſdem quidem omninò verbis, at diverſâ Dialecto, Doricâ ſcilicet conſcriptos? — indeque tenui ac facili immutatione Ocelli Opera ad Atticam traducta Dialectum?* and in the Words before quoted [*Hinc certa porius*, &c.] He anſwers the Cavils of thoſe who ſuſpected *Ocellus* from his Dialect, and handſomly turns their own Cavils againſt them. But I muſt give Dr. *Bentley* his Due, and own he has here made ſome Improvement: for *Vizzanius* never thought of carrying this Argument ſo far as to prove, that becauſe theſe few Fragments cited by *Stobæus* exactly agree with

Ocel-

Ocellus, as we now have him, therefore *'tis certain, that every Word of the True Book is faithfully preſerv'd.* This was a Conſequence reſerv'd for Dr. *Bentley*, which a Common Critic, who reaſons but like other men, would never have thought of: and it being the only one which he has produc'd of his Own on this Occaſion, I ſhould not be juſt to him, unleſs I fairly told the World, that he *did not borrow it.*

And now, why don't the Critics, Great and Small, riſe up to do him Homage? How many *Letters can he produce from Learned Men abroad*, who have paid him their acknowledgments for this Information? What has he to ſay for himſelf? can he pretend not to have ſeen this Edition of *Ocellus*? how came he then to hit juſt upon all *Vizzanius* ſays, and no more? has he not ſeen the *Amſterdam Edition* of Dr. *Gale* neither? To what purpoſe, does he think, that Dr. *Gale* ſet thoſe Four Paſſages out of *Stobæus* before his Edition, but to let People ſee that his Author was Genuine, and writ in Doric? He did not indeed make a Stir with that matter in his Preface, becauſe he knew that *Vizzanius* had exhauſted the point before Him; and he thought it not fit for Him to take the humble and diſhonourable Task of tranſcribing another Man's Labours, either with, or without naming him.

I am glad of this Opportunity of mentioning the Worthy *Dean of York*, and of paying my Publick Acknowledgments to him, for the particular Kindneſs and Favours I receiv'd from him, while I was under his Care. The

Foun-

Foundation of all the little Knowledge I have in theſe matters was laid by Him; which I gratefully own: for I think my ſelf oblig'd to let the World know, whom I have been beholden to; tho' Dr. *Bentley*, I find, be of another Opinion.

And now I think I may without Vanity ſay, that I have outdone Dr. *Bentley* in the way of *Diſcovery*: for Mine, as inconſiderable as it is, is a Diſcovery; and ſuch an one, as proves His to be None.

FROM the particular *Idiom* of Speech which *Phalaris* us'd, Dr. *Bentley* has *prov'd* nothing but this, that he can Conſtrue a Latin Preface, take a Learned Man's Notions, and calmly put 'em off for his own; and then imperiouſly ſummon in the Men of Letters to do Obeyſance to Him, as the Firſt Diſcoverer: all which I, and his Readers, would readily have allow'd him, without putting him to the trouble of proving it. Having therefore thus ſtrenuouſly manag'd the Argument of *the Dialect*, he now turns his Formidable Pen to another kind of Proof: He has found out, that the *Greek* even of that Dialect is more *Modern* than the Times of *Phalaris*.

His Arguments on this Head are ſo far from making any thing to his purpoſe, that one would imagine he brought 'em only as ſo many Inſtances to illuſtrate what he ſaid in the 13th Page, that Men *have been deceiv'd in their Conjectures of this Nature even to Ridicule*. For, could he make out what he aims at, and produce ſome Expreſſions from theſe Epiſtles,

Epiſtles, that are not us'd by the Polite Greek Writers, what would he inferr from hence? that theſe Words were certainly coin'd ſince the Age of *Phalaris*? how does he know but that they might be Then in uſe, and drop'd afterwards when the Learned Age came on; and reviv'd again, as that declin'd? *Horace* thought ſuch Changes and Revolutions in Speech not unuſual: and it might eaſily be prov'd, that there have been many ſuch, both in the Greek and Latin Tongue; but that Dr. *Bentley* has made the Proof of it ſuperfluous here: for he has not produc'd any One Word, that is of that New Stamp he pretends. And among all the *Marks and Moles* (*a*) which, he ſays, *betray the Epiſtles to be a Thouſand Years younger than* Phalaris (*b*), he has had the Judgment to chuſe out ſuch, as betray Him to be as little a Critic in the Greek Language, as he is in his Own.

(*a*) Differ. P. 52.
(*b*) P. 51.

He has ſo propos'd his Firſt Inſtance, that He and I ſhall have no Diſpute about it in This Place: ἐγκρίνω, in the ſenſe of *accuſing*, is, he ſays, *an Innovation in Language, for which the Ancients us'd* κατακρίνω. I entirely agree with him, 'tis an Innovation in Language, and a very Modern one; ſo Modern, that I ſuſpect 'twas firſt broach'd by *a Little Greek*, that writ towards the latter end of the 17th Century: (whom I ſhall not forget to talk with on this ſcore, when I find his Criticiſm in its Proper Place, among the *Faults of the Verſion*) and conſequently I apprehend the Epiſtles to be in no danger from This Word; but the next ſeems to carry Terror in it. For the Dr. de-

clares,

clares, that προδεδωκότα, which in the XVII. *Epist.* must signifie, *having given before*, was *never so us'd by the Ancients, but always for having betray'd.* And this is One of the Instances that is to bring down the Date of the Letters a *Thousand Years* lower than their pretended Author. Let it have its force to the Confusion of *Phalaris*, and all his Adherents: but what shall we do for St. *Paul*? He comes far within this Period; so that the Writings that carry his Name must be Four hundred Years Younger than We Christians suppose 'em: and the Epistle to the *Romans* could not be the Genuine Work of that *Apostle*, but was penn'd (as *Phalaris*'s Epistles were) by some *more Recent Sophist*; whom Dr. *Bentley* has *detected and unmask'd* by the word προέδωκεν, employ'd to signifie, *he gave before*; [*Rom.* xi. 35.] but *never* us'd in this sense, till many Ages after our Saviour. What shall we say to this? Shall we allow Dr. *Bentley* to be a Scurvy Critic, or shall we in Tenderness to his Honour, give up our Bibles? Perhaps the Dr. may, for this once, be mistaken: and I'm the rather inclin'd to think he is, because I find προδίδωμι and προίημι us'd in the very same sense by the best Writers of Antiquity, Xenophon (*a*), Demosthenes (*b*), and Aristotle (*c*), if the Oeconomicks be his.

(*a*) Καὶ τὸν τῆ προεμένῳ (in margine restitus προεμελόμενον) ἀπὸ τούτου ἔφη, ἐπιμελῶς προϊέναι, ὅτι τὸ τρέφοντα πολὺ πρόσοδον ἐστιν. Which Leunclavius rightly translates, *Praterea Cyrus & stipendium tribus illis debitum persolvit, & menstruum aliud ante tempus numeravit.* Xen. Hellen. l. 2, p. 441.

(*b*) — μισθοφορὰς προϊέντες, ὡς ὃν πρόσθεν ἐδίδοσαν, δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐλάττω ἀπέδοσαν. Orat. περὶ Πεπαν.

(*c*) — ἐπεὶ τὸ μισθῶσαι ἢ ἀφεῖναι αὐτὸν ἐνεργεῖν, ὅτι τῶν προϊεμένων τριμήνων ἐπράξατο δυοῖν ἀντοῖν ἐδόθη. Oecon. l. 2.

Ar-

Theſe are Great Authorities; but if they ſhould prevail with the Dr. to withdraw this Argument, we are not yet ſafe; he has ſtill a ſtronger Objection againſt the Epiſtles of St. *Paul* and *Phalaris*, taken from the word διώκω, put for *following*; *which*, he ſays, *anciently ſignified to purſue, when that which fled fear'd and ſhunn'd the Purſuer.* What pity 'tis, the Knowing Dr. *Hody* had not learnt this Secret Piece of Criticiſm ſooner? how eaſily might he have prov'd the Septuagint of a much leſs Authority, and Later Date than *Poſſius* contended for, by that Expreſſion in *Ezra* (ix. 4.) πᾶς ὁ διώκων λόγον Θεοῦ? by which however the LXX, I ſuppoſe, were far from meaning, *Every one that perſecutes the Word of God.* Διώκω, as I remember, is us'd once only by *Phalaris* in this ſenſe; but I'm ſure 'tis frequently ſo employ'd by St. *Paul*; and Remarkable it is, that in One Paſſage of his Epiſtles the Word is taken both in *Phalaris*'s *following*, and Dr. *Bentley*'s *perſecuting* Senſe, within the Compaſs of two Lines: διώκοντες τὴν φιλοξενίαν, διῶκε τὸν ἕτερον, *Rom.* XII. 13, 14. Now let *Phalaris* ſhift for himſelf; but I am agen concern'd to put in one word for our *Apoſtle*. Would Dr. *Bentley* give himſelf Time to conſider, he would find, that διώκω, in all its various acceptations ſtill implies the Notion of *Following*: ſometimes the Thing *follow'd* has reaſon to fly and fear the Follower; and then it ſignifies to *purſue* in Dr. *Bentley*'s ſenſe: but ſometimes the Thing *follow'd* is leſs shy and timerous; and then it ſignifies barely *to follow*. *Theocritus* ſays,

'A

Ἀπὸ τῆς μήκωνος ἐλαύνω τὴν ὄρνιν δείλαιον.

Now tho' the *Kid* might be afraid of the *Wolf*, yet the *Cytisus* is not so apt to run away from the *Kid*: and *Virgil* therefore, who understood the force of a Greek Word as well as Dr. *Bentley*, translates it thus,

Lupus ipse Capellam,
Florentem Cytisum sequitur *lascivus Capella,*

where the Word *sequitur*, which is of it self Indifferent, is, as the Greek Word διώκει is in *Theocritus*'s Verse, determin'd to signifie differently by the several things to which it is apply'd. In much the same sense it is us'd by *Aristotle*, throughout his Ethicks, wherever he has occasion to express a pursuit after Honour, Riches, Pleasure, Virtue, and many such Objects, which are under no fearful apprehensions of the pursuer. If Dr. *Bentley* be not yet convinc'd, I refer him for his farther satisfaction to *Plato* (*a*), and *Dionysius Halicarnassens* (*b*); and I desire him particularly to consider those Words of *Xenophon* in the Memoirs of *Socrates*, χρὴ νὺν φυκτέον φάγειν, ἢ τὸν ἐγγυτάτω διώκειν, which, according to the little Skill I have in Greek, is to be translated thus, *We ought to fly the Men of a Troublesome Temper; and to court the Candid.* But if διώκειν here signifies *to pursue*,

(*a*) Ταῦτα γὰρ, ὦ Κέβης, ('Tis *Socrates* speaks) ἔφη, ἐστὶν ἃ δεῖ ζητεῖν, καὶ ἃ οὐδεμιᾷ μηχανῇ φευκτέον ἐστὶν ἀνθρώποις, ὡς διώκειν δή, ὡς ἴσως, πάντες σπουδάζουσι τυγχάνειν. Phædo.

(*b*) Ὅλην τὴν ἐπιοῦσαν ἡσυχίαν εἶχον, εἰς τὴν πόλιν *Faustulus* follow'd *Romulus* into the City. P. 52.

ſue: then φεύγων, which is oppos'd to it, would ſignifie *to follow*: and ſo indeed we ſhould have a Precept for Courting Dr. *Bentley*.

He inſtances agen in theſe words, παιδῶν ἐρᾶσαι, which in one of the Epiſtles are meant to expreſs *Lovers of their Children*; whereas, ſays he, *this of Old would have been taken for a Flagitious Love of Boys*; and he would argue from thence, that this uſe of the word muſt be introduc'd by ſome Modern Sophiſt. Now to Me the Argument ſeems to lye quite the other way; and ſince the words παίδων ἐρᾶσαι and παιδεραστεῖν were, in latter times, of ſuch infamous uſage, 'tis not to be imagin'd, that a Sophiſt ſhould put 'em into *Phalaris*'s Mouth, to expreſs *the Love of Children*: but 'tis very conceivable, that this in *Phalaris*'s time might be an innocent Expreſſion; tho' afterwards, as *Greece* grew lewder, it had a Double Meaning, and was therefore not fit to be us'd. I'm ſure, I can give a better reaſon for my conjecture, than the Dr. can for his; and it is this: Whenever *Phalaris* has occaſion to expreſs the *Scandalous Love of Boys*, he does not uſe this word, as Later Authors do; he calls *Lyſimus* (Ep. VIII.) νεηνίσκον ἐκ παίδων, but not παιδεραστεῖν; which, if the Word had then born as Vile a ſenſe as it did afterwards, he would certainly have done: for he had a little of Dr. *Bentley* in him at that time, and was beſtowing the very Worſt Names he could think of upon his Adverſaries. Beſides; παίδων ἐρᾶσαι and παιδεραστεῖν ſound very differently; and if we take the Whole Sentence in *Phalaris* together, οὐκοῦν παίδων ὄντος ἐρᾶσαι τοιούτους πόθους οὐκ ἔχει εἰς τίνα, the Connexion plain-

ly ſhews, that παίζων ἐρᾶται can have no ill meaning. Nay, long after *Phalaris*'s time, we have Inſtances where theſe Words are employ'd in a Vertuous Senſe: *Plato* uſes 'em ſo almoſt every where; particularly in his Συμπόσιον they recurr often, and under a Chaſte meaning *, if *Plato*'s own word may be taken for it. If Dr. *Bentley* thinks otherwiſe, and dares ſay ſo, I leave him to be ſcourg'd by Mr. *Norris*, and the reſt of the *Platoniſts*.

* παίζων μὲν ὁ τοῦτο τὸ παιδικὸς καὶ τὸ φιλεραστὴς λέγειλαι, ἅμα τι ξυγγενὶς ἀναζώμενος, *Says one of the Perſons in that Dialogue* —— *Who immediately afterwards profeſſes, that he meant not theſe Words of a* Laſcivious Love: ὑβρὶ γὸ ἂν ὀξεπεῖν ἐδ ὁ σῶφρων ἀφροδισίων σωμάτων ἀλλ' ἐρᾶτὸν ἐπὶ μεγάλης σπουδῆς· *In the ſame manner* τὸ παιδικὸν, *which generally had a Scandalous Senſe, is by* Plato *often us'd in a Good one: particularly in his* Phædrus; *where* Socrates *calls* Lyſias *the Orator* φαίδρου τοῦ παιδικοῦ, Phædri Delicix, *becauſe of* Phædrus's *admiring and delighting in* Lyſias's *Orations. See* p. 236.

Till I am at leiſure to look out for more Authorities, I hope *Plato* may be thought conſiderable enough to countenance *Phalaris* in the uſe of this Expreſſion: but the Dr. has ſtill a Proof in reſerve, which he takes to be the moſt diſtinguiſhing Mark of a Late Writer. Θυγατρὶ (Ep. CXLII.) is us'd for *Maidens*: this, he ſays, is *a moſt manifeſt token of a Later Greek*; *even* Tzetzes *interprets it* Θεραπαινίδι: that is, (if I can make any Senſe of what he ſays) this Uſe of the Word is ſo modern, that even *Tzetzes* himſelf was aſham'd ſo to employ it, and therefore put Θεραπαινίδι inſtead of it. But if *Tzetzes*'s Judgment may go for any thing, he's of my ſide; for he cites the Epiſtles as Genuine: and therefore to be ſure did not ſubſtitute θεραπαινίδι in the room

room of θυγατέρα, becauſe he thought this ſenſe of the word Modern. And here again I muſt put the Dr. in mind of his Bible. For in the LXX. we find, πολλαὶ θυγατέρες ἐπάϛαντο πλοῦτον, (*Prov.* xxxi. 29.) where θυγατέρες muſt mean *Women*, or *Maidens*: But theſe Maidens were *Some body's Daughters*; and ſo, I ſuppoſe, were thoſe that *Phalaris* preſented to his Friend. The ſame Expreſſion recurrs too in the Evangeliſts, where they tell us what our Saviour ſaid to the Woman that touch'd the Hem of his Garment; St. *Matthew* has it, θάρσει θύγατερ, ἡ πίϛις σε σέσωκέ σε; and St. *Mark*, θύγατερ, ἡ πίϛις σε σέσωκέ σε. I need not go farther for Inſtances, ſince 'tis probable that this Criticiſm is altogether founded on a miſtake; and what we now read θυγατέρα in the modern MSS. of *Phalaris*, was in the more ancient ones contractedly written θερα, which might be read either θυγατέρα, or θεραπαίνα, as the Copyer chanc'd to hit upon it. *Tzetzes* therefore might truly *read*, and not *interpret*, it θεραπαίνα; and (as it has often happen'd in Other Caſes) this True Reading, which is corrupted in the entire MS. of the Author, be preſerv'd in this cited Paſſage of him. If our great Dealer in MSS. did not obſerve this, where is his Sagacity? If he obſerv'd it, without owning it, where is his Sincerity? He muſt give me leave now and then to ask him an Inſulting Queſtion; He has ask'd me a great many. But I have One Enquiry more to make of him on this occaſion; and that is, Whether he thinks, that his *Philoſophical Lectures* ſerve more to the eſtabliſhment of Religion, than his *Criticiſms* do to overthrow it? For is he not Poſitive, that the Idioms of the Letters prove them to be

a Thouſand Years later than Phalaris? And are not ſome of theſe very Idioms frequently to be met with both in the *Goſpels* and *Epiſtles*? Should not ſo Profound a Grecian and Divine as He is have look'd a little into the New Teſtament, before he had pronounc'd ſuch raſh and groundleſs Aſſertions? Could Men imagine One, who writes at this rate, to have any Meaning, they would think he had a very ill one: but the whole management of this Controverſie clears him from all ſuſpicions of Meaning and Deſign.

Theſe are all the *Marks of Novity*, which he has given himſelf the trouble to take notice of; *They that will ſearch*, he ſays, *may find more of this ſort*: without queſtion they may; but if they don't find ſome of *another ſort*, they'll have the Diſcretion to keep their Diſcoveries to themſelves, and not expoſe 'em to be corrected by every one that can turn an *Index*, or a *Lexicon* (*a*). By ſuch Helps as theſe, 'twould be eaſie to collect Authorities in abundance againſt every Inſtance that Dr. *Bentley* has brought on this head: but I am ſo far from valuing my ſelf upon a multitude of Quotations, that I wiſh there had been no occaſion for thoſe few I have produc'd; and think I am oblig'd to excuſe my ſelf to the Reader for that mixture of Latin and Greek, with which I am forc'd to vary this Odd Work of mine. I can only ſay, that I have been as ſparing in this way, as Dr. *Bentley* would give me leave to be: and I have the rather avoided being tedious upon the Particular Point in debate between

(*a*) Nec ſanè quiſquam eſt tam procul à cognitione eorum remotus, ut non Indicem certè ex Bibliothecâ ſumptum transferre in Libros ſuos poſſit. *Quint. Inſtit. l.* 10, *c.* 1.

us, that I might have room to examine the General Reflection which he has made upon the Change and Decay of Languages.

It is eaſie (ſays the Dr.) *from the very turn and faſhion of the Style to diſtinguiſh a freſh Engliſh Compoſition from another a hundred Years old. Now there are as real and ſenſible Differences in the* Greek; *were there as many that could diſcern them. But very few are ſo vers'd and practis'd in that Language, as ever to arrive at that Subtilty of Taſt* *. I can eaſily grant, that the *Engliſh* Tongue has undergone very conſiderable and ſurprizing Changes, eſpecially in this Laſt Century; till about the middle of which, we did not in good earneſt ſet about the Cultivating and Refining it: and then carried our Improvements ſo far, that Some who wrote at the beginning of this Century are not now eaſily underſtood. At our beſt, We are perhaps a little too fond of adopting Foreign Words; and fancying, out of a Modeſty peculiar to our Nation, that we have not ſtock enough of our own, are continually borrowing from our Neighbours: and this brings a great many New Phraſes in upon us, and conſequently antiquates a great many others. Beſides we have few things in our Tongue writ with any tolerable Degree of perfection; and They therefore who would write or ſpeak well, have no Patterns to look up to, no ſure Rule, but the preſent Mode of the Age, to guide themſelves by: and as faſt as That alters therefore, the Manner of writing muſt alter along with it. But now if Dr. *Bentley* pretends to point out as *Real and Senſible Differences* in the ſeveral Ages of the

* Diſſ. p. 52

1690

Greek, as a moderate Critic may in the *Engliſh*, I'm afraid his *Subtilty of Taſt* will fail him. Does he take the *Greek* of *Lucian* to be as different from that of *Plato*, as our *Engliſh* Now is from that which was ſpoken ſoon after the Conqueſt? Are not *Homer* and *Oppian* much nearer one another in their Language than *Chaucer* and *Cowly*, tho' in Time they are far more diſtant? No body is ſo abſurd as to ſay, that the Greek Tongue did not admit of ſome few Alterations in Every Age; but 'twas incomparably the moſt fix'd and enduring of any that we are generally acquainted with: and I ſhall offer at Some Reaſons, that gave it this remarkable advantage over other Languages. 'Twas early improv'd and adorn'd by Men of the greateſt Genius that ever appear'd in the World; They poliſh'd and perfected it to that degree, that it was admirably fitted to all the Purpoſes of Speech and Ways of Writing imaginable: They wrought it up into all the Majeſty and Grace, all the Sweetneſs and Smoothneſs that an Happy Compoſition of Words, an Harmonious mixture of Vowels and Diphthongs, or a Juſt Cadency of Syllables could give it. The beſt Greek Writers had generally Skill in Muſic; which was infus'd into 'em from their Infancy, and none were reckon'd well-bred that wanted it. This made their Ear juſt, and fine: and the fineneſs of their Ear eaſily ſlid into their Tongue; model'd their Speech, and made it Tuneable. They brought all the Learning in the World into their Language; and wrote in the beſt manner, upon all the moſt uſeful and pleaſing Subjects, that could bene-

benefit, or entertain Mankind. The Natural Perfection of their Tongue, and the diſtinguiſhing Excellency of their Authors in all Kinds of Knowledge, and Ways of Writing, made 'em a Compleat Standard and Model to other Nations, and after-Ages; upon which every one endeavour'd to form himſelf. So that what was ſure always to be lik'd, could not chuſe but laſt long. Their Empire alſo did not a little contribute to the Stability and Prevalence of their Language: They overcame a Great part of the World, and extended their Tongue with their Conqueſts, ſo as to make it Univerſal; All Nations borrow'd from Them, but They had that Contempt of the Barbarity of other Countries, that they were ſhy of ſuffering either their Manners, or their Speech to be introduc'd among 'em. This Pride they preſerv'd in a great meaſure, even when the *Roman* Empire was at its utmoſt heighth; and while *Rome* flouriſh'd with the Glory of Arms, the Seat of Learning ſtill continu'd at *Athens*. This kept the Language ſo far entire and unmix'd, that we have *Greek* Books writ by Authors at almoſt Two thouſand Years diſtance, who diſagree leſs in their Phraſe and Manner of Speech, than the Books of any Two *Engliſh* Writers do, who liv'd but Two hundred Years aſunder. This then was a Peculiar Happineſs of the *Greek* Tongue; No other Language, that has been of known and familiar uſe in the World, not even the *Latin* it ſelf, enjoy'd any thing like it. An 150 or 200 Years was the utmoſt Length of Time that the Latin Purity continu'd. And therefore,

to *Compare* the *Greek*, the moſt Holding Tongue in the World, with the *Engliſh*, the moſt Fickle and Fleeting of any; and to *Infer* from the obſervable difference between the ſeveral Ages of Engliſh, that there was *as* great a Difference between the ſeveral Ages of Greek; is a *Compariſon* and an *Inference*, which No-body, but Dr. *Bentley*, would have allow'd himſelf to make: that is, (to be plain with him) No-body but One, who has no true Reliſh, no nice Taſt of the Beauties and Proprieties of Either of theſe Languages; or of any Other, that he has yet pretended to judge of, or to write in. By thoſe *Marks and Moles of Novity* which he has pointed out in the Paragraph we are upon, the Reader is by this time ſatisfied, how able he is to aſſign to every Greek Writer his proper Age and Period, meerly by the *Thread and Colour of his Style*. Indeed, tho' he has the Vanity to declare this to be his Extraordinary Faculty, yet he has withal the Modeſty *not to hope that he ſhall convince any body* (a); and in this, I dare ſay, he is not miſtaken. For 'tis ſomewhat hard to imagine, how a Man ſhould enter into the Spirit and Delicacy, and all the Various Niceties of a Dead Tongue, who is ſo far from having any exquiſite ſenſe of theſe things, even in that very Tongue, which he was born and bred up in. I ſhall take an occaſion by and bye to give the Reader ſuch a Specimen of his Engliſh Eloquence, as will diſcourage any body (if there be any body left, who is not yet diſcourag'd) from chuſing Him for a Taſter. In the mean time, to ſtay the Reader's Longing, I ſhall inſtance in One Hap-

(a) Diſſer. p. 52.

Happy Phraſe, newly minted by the Dr. in this very Paragraph: he ſpeaks here of the *Mien of a Face*; which, as I take it, is much the ſame thing with the *Behaviour of a Look*, or the *Carriage of a Smile*: I do not know how particular the Dr's *Mien*, or his *Face*, may be; for, to my knowledge, I never ſaw him; but the *Mien of the Face* of his Style the Reader muſt allow me, even from this ſingle inſtance, is ſomewhat extraordinary!

THE Uſe of the *Attic Dialect* was made one ſhrewd Objection againſt *Phalaris*; the Uſe of the *Attic Talent*, Dr. *Bentley* is reſolv'd, ſhall be another. This Way of Counting recurrs pretty often in the Epiſtles; however not ſo often, as that an Argument built upon it ſhould deſerve to be rank'd among *the General Proofs*: but I am ſo little ſenſible of the force of it, that I am willing to allow it a place there; and if Dr. *Bentley* can make it out, I promiſe to renounce, not thoſe Particular Epiſtles only from whence 'tis taken, but the Whole Sett of them.

The Dr. upon this Article, accuſes his *Mock-Phalaris* of miſtaking the *Sicilian Talent*: and this Miſtake of his, he, with his uſual Gaiety, calls *a Slippery Way of telling Money* (*a*); and therefore cautions us againſt *dealing with him* (*b*). He explains himſelf thus, — That the *Sicilian Talent* was the Loweſt of any; that *Phalaris* promiſing in his Epiſtles to ſeveral of his Countrymen Talents in General, muſt be underſtood to mean *Sicilian* Ta-

(*a*) Differ. *p.* 52.
(*b*) Ibid. *p.* 54.

Talents, whereas he means nothing like it. *Now* (ſays the Dr.) *if a Bargain were made in* England, *to pay ſo many* Pounds, *or* Marks; *and the Party ſhould pretend at laſt, that he meant* Scots Marks, *or* French Livres; *few, I ſuppoſe, would care to have Dealings with him. And this is the very Caſe in ſo many of theſe Letters* *. So far from being the Caſe, that the Caſe is juſt contrary! For if the *Sicilian* Talents were ſo very Low, and *Phalaris* muſt be thought to intend them in his Promiſes, and yet paid *Attic* ones; Thoſe he dealt with had certainly no reaſon to complain of him. Would a man think himſelf ill us'd in *Scotland*, who ſhould have a General Promiſe made him of ſo many *Pounds*, which he expected to be made good in the *Pounds* of the Country, and receiv'd 'em afterwards in good *Engliſh Sterling?* What could poſſibly give this Perverſe Turn even to Dr. *Bentley*'s Imagination? What Cloudy Author had he been converſing with, that could put him into this State of Perplexity and Confuſion? We have great hopes indeed that the Intricate Accounts of this Paragraph ſhould be clear'd up, by ſuch an Head, in ſuch Order! But, it may be, the Dr. did not intend this for a Remark that was to Edifie his Reader; but for a pure piece of harmleſs Diverſion. Having therefore ſported himſelf a little, he reſumes the Chair, and thus authoritatively dictates to us.

* Diſſert. *p.* 54.

We are to know, that in Sicily, *as in moſt other Countries, the Name and Value of their Coins, and the way of reckoning by Summs, was peculiar. The Sum* Talent, *in the* Sicilian *Accompt, contain'd no more in Specie than Three* Attic *Drachms, or*

or Roman *Denares*; *as plainly appears from* Ariſtotle *, *in his now loſt Treatiſe of the* Sicilian Government. *And the Words of* Feſtus *are moſt expreſs*; Talentorum non unum Genus: Atticum eſt ſex millium Denariûm, Syracuſanum trium denariûm. *What an Immenſe Difference! One* Attic *Talent had the real value of Two thouſand* Sicilian *Talents. Now in all theſe Epiſtles the very Circumſtances aſſure us, that by the word* Talent *ſimply nam'd, the* Attic *Talent is underſtood. But ſhould not our wiſe Sophiſt have known, that a* Talent, *in that Country where he had laid the Scene of his Letters, was quite another thing? Without Queſtion, if the true* Phalaris *had penn'd them, he would have reckon'd theſe Summs by the* Sicilian *Talents, encreaſing only the Number: Or ſhould he have made uſe of the* Attic *Accompt, he ſhould always have given expreſs notice of it; never ſaying* τάλαντον *alone, without the addition of* Ἀττικόν (*a*).

* *Pollux, l.* ix, *c.* 6.

(*a*) Differ. *p.* 54, 55.

Now, in oppoſition to the Dr's Reaſonings and Authorities about this matter of the *Talents*, I ſhall endeavour to ſhew, that what the Dr. ſays *we are to know*, we are ſtill *to know*, after all the Information he has vouchſaf'd to give us: and that if we did *know* it, we could not from thence gather, that theſe Epiſtles are Spurious. For if there is Room to ſuſpect that the Dr's Witneſſes are corrupted, if their Teſtimony is inconſiſtent, if they tell us things demonſtratively falſe, if the Dr. ſays more than his Witneſſes do, if there be ſtronger Authority to counterbalance theirs; if, admitting what they ſay, or what the Dr. makes 'em ſay, to be true, the Letters may be nevertheleſs Authentic: if theſe things can be made

made good, the Dr. will, I hope, pardon me, if I refuse to part with *Phalaris*, upon any Quarrel about the *Talents*.

The Dr's Witnesses are *Pollux*, and *Festus*, whom I shall examine severally. *Aristotle* indeed is call'd in for a Witness; but He not appearing in Person, we have his Testimony only at second hand: so that its force will wholly depend on the Authority of *Pollux*, the Relater. To Him we are referr'd in the Margin; but it doth not appear from the Book and Chapter there cited, that the Treatise of *Aristotle* which, the Dr. says, is *now Lost*, was ever *found*. That *Aristotle* wrote Πολιτείας, or accounts of the State and Polity of several Particular Cities, and of several *Sicilian* Cities among the rest, is sufficiently known *: but that he wrote any thing which bore such a Title as *a Treatise of the Sicilian Government*, we want the Light of some other Lost Treatise to make plain to us. A Treatise of *Aristotle*, but not under this Name, is cited by *Pollux* in this Chapter: but whether that part of this Chapter which concerns the Value of *Talents* be genuine, we have Room to doubt. *Seberus*, in his Notes on *Pollux*, tells us, that from *Pag.* 435, *v.* 32, of his Edition, to the End of the 6th Chapter (within which space all that is said of *Talents* lies) is wanting in One MS But allowing it to be genuine, what the Dr. says is plain from that place in *Pollux*, is so far from being plain from thence, that *Pollux* must be chang'd and help'd out from other Authors, before he can

* Πολιτείαι πόλεων δ' οἵδε διέξιον ἐξαιρέτως καὶ ἐμπόνως, καὶ Σικελίαν δημιεργικάν, ὁλοσχερῶς, καὶ πραγματικῶς. *Diog.* in Vitâ *Arist.*

can be made to ſpeak to the purpoſe. It plainly appears to the Dr. from *Ariſtotle*, as there cited by *Pollux*, that *the Summ* Talent *in the* Sicilian *Accompt contain'd no more in Specie than three* Attic *Drachms, or* Roman *Denares.* But tho' the *Sicilian* Talent be there mention'd, 'tis neither adjuſted to *Attic* Drachms, nor *Roman* Denares (*a*). Two ſorts of *Sicilian* Talents are there taken notice of; an Ancient, and a Later: That equal to 24 *Nummi*, This to 12. And the *Nummus* is ſaid to be equal to three ὑμόλια. So that before the Value of the *Sicilian Talent* can be ſettled from this Paſſage, the Value of the *Nummus* ſhould be firſt agreed on; which it will not be very eaſie to fix from its given proportion to the ὑμόλια, becauſe that is a Species of Mony we are Strangers to; and the Criticks are agreed we owe that Coin purely to a Corrupt Reading of the Text: (which, by the bye, is much ſuch an Inſtance of *Equivocal Generation*, as that which the Dr. tells us of *, where he makes *Muſhrooms to grow out of a Rotten Paſſage in* Suidas). Some therefore for ὑμόλια read ὀβόλια, others ἡμιοβόλια. This Latter muſt be own'd to be a greater departure from the Letter of the Text than the Former; ſo that if we admit it in order to our ſetling the value of the *Nummus*, and conſequently of the *Talent*, we do not owe our Light in this matter to what we read in *Pollux*, but to what we gather from our

(*a*) Τὰ μέντοι Σικελικὸν πλάντον ἐλάττονα ἴσχυε· τὸ μὲν ἀρχαῖον, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης λέγει, τίσσαρας καὶ εἴκοσι τοὺς νόμμους· τὸ δὲ ὕστερον δυοκαίδεκα· ἕνδεκα δὲ τὰ νόμμα τρία * ὑμόλια. Poll. *l.* 9, *c.* 6.

* Diſſert. *p.* 118.

our own Conjectures, or from other Authors. When we have put ἡμιοβόλια for ἡμόλια, 'tis granted, that the *Nummus*, which is equal to three *half-Obolus's*, or one *Obolus* and an half, is the same with the *Nummus Sestertius* of the *Romans*: the value of which being known from other Authors, and it's proportion to the *Roman Denare*; the proportion of the *Sicilian Talent* to the *Roman Denare* is thereby made out. But those who go this way to work in setling the value of the *Sicilian* Talent from this obscure and corrupted passage, seem to take it for granted, that the Greek word νόμμος in *Pollux* means the Roman *Nummus*; or *Sestertius*, and then adjust the obscure word ἡμόλια (by changing it into ἡμιοβόλια) to the known value of the *Sestertius*. But *Pollux* tells us, that tho' (*a*) νόμμος may seem to be a *Roman* Name of Mony, yet it is a *Greek* one, and a Term of the *Dorians* in *Italy*, and *Sicily*. And if so, 'tis more probable that the *Sicilian Talent* is here compar'd to the *Dorian* or *Sicilian Nummi*, whatever those were, than to the *Roman Sestertii*. Had *Pollux* given us the Value of the *Sicilian* Talent in his own Name and Words, we might have suppos'd that he adjusted it to the *Roman* Monies; but 'tis absurd to think that *Aristotle*, whose words (*b*) are here cited for the value of the Talent, should give it us in *Roman Sestertii*, which were a Coin not stamp'd at *Rome*, till after *Aristotle's*

(*a*) Ὁ δὲ νόμμος δοκεῖ μὲν τῶν Ῥωμαίων τίνημα τὸ νομίσμα εἶναι· ἔστι δὲ Ἑλληνικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ καὶ Σικελίᾳ Δωριέων. *L.* 9, *C.* 6.

(*b*) Τὸ μὲν ἀρχαῖον, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης λέγει, καὶ νόμμους, &c. ut supra.

ſtotle's time (*a*). So that the Ground upon which the receiv'd Computation of the *Sicilian Talent* ſeems to have been made, plainly fails. But admitting the *Nummus* here to be the ſame with the *Roman Seſtertius*, which we have good reaſon not to admit; and that ἡμιωβόλια is rightly ſubſtituted, which we have no reaſon to grant: yet after all Dr. *Bentley* has impos'd upon us in his valuation of the *Sicilian Talent*. For the Value of the more Ancient *Sicilian* Talent, which is equal to 24 *Nummi* or *Seſtertii*, will be equivalent not to *Three*, but to *Six Roman Denarei*, or *Attic Drachms*; it being agreed on all hands, that each *Seſtertius* is one fourth part of a *Denare* or *Drachm*: ſo that the Dr. has ſunk the value of the *Sicilian Talent* (admitting this Computation) half in half. The Later *Sicilian* Talent will indeed at this rate be, as the Dr. puts it; but the more Ancient one will be double its Value. But tho' the Dr. in his way of *telling Money* after *Pollux*, ſlips the Old Talent, (which it had been fair to have taken notice of, ſince *Phalaris* muſt be ſuppos'd to reckon by thoſe Talents that were moſt ancient) and gives us the value only of the *Later* one; yet the difference between theſe Two Talents is not, I own, ſo great, as to be worth contending for: ſince 'tis freely acknowledg'd, that the Talents mention'd in *Phalaris* muſt be put at a higher rate than even the greater *Sicilian Talent*, if that

(*a*) *Who dy'd* Olymp. cxiv, 3. *according to* Laertius. *And* Pliny *tells us*, Argentum ſignatum eſt Anno urbis 585, (*others read* 485) Quinto Fabio Conſule, 5 annis ante primum Punicum bellum. *Nat. Hiſt. l.* 33.

Now A. U. C. 585, *falls in with* Ol. 153. A. U. C. 485, *with* Ol. 128.

that was worth no more than *Six Roman Denarii*, or *Attic Drachmi*. The value of a *Denare*, or *Drachm*, is computed by all Authors, and may be prov'd by the Scales to be equal to 7 *d. ob.* ſo that Six of theſe will amount to 3 *s.* 9 *d.* the Price, as is pretended, of the Greater *Sicilian* Talent: and Three of them, to half that Summ, 1 *s.* 10 *d. ob.* the value of Dr. *Bentley*'s Talent. But now if *Pollux* had expreſly told me from *Ariſtotle*, that theſe were the ſeveral Values of the Two *Sicilian* Talents, I ſhould have made ſome difficulty of giving him any Credit in this matter. For I find, that this ſame *Pollux*, as we now have him, cites *Ariſtotle* for things of this nature, which even upon *Ariſtotle*'s Authority I cannot admit. He tells us from *Ariſtotle* (*a*), that the *Sicilians* reckon'd that Two Braſs Pieces (χαλκοῦ) were equal to Six *Litra*; and that Six Braſs Pieces were equal to half a *Litra*. Now, that Two ſhould be twelve times as much as Six, is not according to the receiv'd Rules of Arithmetic: To puzzle us ſtill more, *Pollux* tells us in another place (*b*), from the ſame Treatiſe of *Ariſtotle*, that Six Talents are equal to Two Braſs Pieces; and that Three Talents are equal to Three of the ſame Braſs pieces; that is, that Three are more than Six. I beg to be excus'd, if I cannot believe *Pollux*, that *Ariſtotle* counted

(*a*) Ἐν Ἰμεραίων πολιτείᾳ φησὶν (Ἀριστοτέλης) ὡς οἱ μὲν Σικελιῶται τὰς δύο χαλκᾶς ἑξάλιτρα χαλκοῦν τὰς δὲ ἓξ, ἡμίλιτρον. L. 4, C. 24.

(*b*) Παρ' αὐτῷ (Ἀριστοτέλει) πῃ δὲ ἐν τῇ Ἰμεραίων πολιτείᾳ ἐξ ἄλλα ἴσχυε Σικελῶν ἐνόμιζον, οὓς ἰσχίας, ὅτε δυώδεκα χαλκοῦς ἴσα· ἐξ ἓξ τάλαντα. ὅτε δὲ δύο χαλκοῦς, ἐξ τρία τάλαντα, ἴσον τρεῖς. L. 9, C. 6.

counted at this rate; becauſe I always thought, that *Ariſtotle* had ſome little Skill in Mathematicks. It would not perhaps be difficult to offer ſome Emendations, that might ſet theſe things right: but till that is done, *Pollux*'s Calculations are of no great Credit with me. *Pollux*, in the ſame place which the Dr. cites for his value of the *Talents*, informs us (*a*), that as the *Attic Talent* was divided into Sixty *Attic Minæ*, and each of thoſe *Minæ* into an Hundred *Attic Drachms*, ſo the *Talent* of each Country was divided into the ſame number of *Minæ*; and each *Mina* into the ſame number of *Drachms*, proportionably to the value of the ſeveral Talents. So that the *Sicilian Mina*, the 60th part of the greater *Sicilian Talent*, will at this rate be juſt Three Farthings of our Mony; and the *Sicilian Drachm*, the hundredth part of that minute Summ, *i. e.* more than three and thirty times leſs than our Farthing. Now it cannot eaſily be imagin'd, that the *Sicilian Drachm*, which was a Coin current amongſt them, ſhould be ſo unconceivably little as it muſt be, if its value were but the three and thirtieth part of our Farthing: and yet we

(*a*) *He tells us expreſly, that the* Mina *of each Country is divided into an hundred Drachms of that Country.* Ἡμνᾶ δὲ ὡς πρὸς Ἀθηναίοις ἑξήκοντά ἐστιν ἡ δραχμαὶ Ἀττικαὶ, οὕτω καὶ πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς ἐμπορίοις δυνάμεις πρὸς λόγον τῶν ἑξήκοντα τάλαντα ἔχ' τὴ μνᾶν, καὶ ἑκάστην. L. 9, C. 6. *And if the* Drachmæ *of each Country riſe and fall in proportion to the* Talent, *it is evident, that there are as many Hundreds of them, that is, as many* Minæ *in one Talent as in another. And ſo* Brerewood *underſtands* Pollux: Omne *Talentum*, ut *Suidas* & *Pollux* inquiunt, continet Minas 60, ut Mina Drachmas 100. Proinde 6000 Drachmas continebat Talentum Omne, proprias ſc. l. ejus regionis, cujus Talentum dici dicebatur. *De Numis*, p. 26.

Talentum quodvis ſexmillia Drachmarum ſui generis habet, quæ ad Atticas reductæ variant. *Gron. de Pec. Vet.* c. 3.

must not stop here, but must carry our Imagination further, and still break that Particle of Metal into Two Parts, if we would reach the Littleness of that other Drachm which answers to the Lesser, or Dr. *Bentley*'s Talent; being not quite the 66th part of our Farthing, and that in Silver too: a Species of Mony, not to be counted without the help of Microscopes. So that when we have occasion hereafter to express the Value, or rather worthlessness, of any contemptible Performance, we shall in complement to the Dr's Criticism say, it is not worth a *Sicilian Drachm*.

I beg the Reader's Patience, while I take a Review of what has been said in answer to the Dr's First Authority. The Value of the *Sicilian* Talent *appears clearly* to him from a *Lost Treatise*, which he owns has long since disappear'd, and which I think never did appear. That part of *Pollux*, where he finds the Remains of this Lost Treatise, is of suspected Credit. If it is Genuine, it is Imperfect; and to be supply'd by Guess. The Supplies which have been made to it seem to have been built upon a Wrong Supposition, that the νομισμα in *Pollux* was a *Roman* Word. When these Supplements are admitted, they do not sink the Talent in dispute quite so low as the Dr. doth. *Pollux*, whose Authority we must depend upon for this Citation from *Aristotle*, cites things of this nature from him which, as they there stand, are demonstrably false. In his Division of the Talent, he breaks it into pieces, which, admitting the Dr's Rate of the Talent, are of no Value, and of no Use.

If

If this Plea (for the Length of which I beg the Reader's pardon) is ſufficient to invalidate the Authority of *Pollux*, the Teſtimony of *Feſtus* will admit of an eaſier Diſpatch. For, not to inſiſt on any of thoſe Exceptions againſt *Pollux*, which affect *Feſtus* equally with Him, it is obſervable that the Book which we now have under the Name of *Feſtus*, is not the Work of *Feſtus*, but compos'd out of ſome Fragments of *Feſtus*, and an *Epitome* of *Feſtus*, which *Paulus Diaconus*, a mean Writer (*a*), whoſe Picture *Scaliger* has ſo drawn, as if an Acquaintance of mine had ſate for it, made in *Charles the Great*'s time. The Original *Feſtus*, if we had him entire, was but an Epitome of *Verrius Flaccus*; and *Scaliger* thinks it a juſt Judgment upon *Feſtus*, for having abridg'd *Flaccus*, that his Epitome was Epitomiz'd by ſo Ignorant a Creature as *Paulus*. But, what is moſt to our Purpoſe, thoſe that give us theſe words of *Feſtus*, (if they be His) which the Dr. ſays are *expreſs* to his point; take care to warn us, that for *Syracuſanum trium Denarium*, we ought to read, *Syracuſanum, triumMillium Denarium*. Which Error may be ſuppos'd eaſily to have crept into the Copies of *Feſtus*, by leaving out the Capital Letter M, between the Words *Trium* and *Denarium*.

(*a*) Paulus Longobardus, homo confidentiſſimus ac ineptiſſimus; nihil Feſto ejus potuit accidere, quàm quòd in hujus Pauli manus incidit. *Joſ. Scalig. in Ep. Ded. ad Caſtigationes in Feſtum.*

I have conſulted all the Editions of *Feſtus* I could meet with; and find none (*a*) which doth not take notice of this Emendation; and This the Dr. could not be a Stranger to: and had *He* therefore been a *Fair Dealer* in this matter, *Feſtus* had not been quoted at ſuch a Looſe Rate, to prove *Phalaris* a *foul* one.

(*a*) Vide Notas *Gothofredi* ad Schedas Feſti fragmento detractas, *p.* 234.

Vide eundem in Notis ad Feſtum, *p.* 1821.

Vide Feſtum ex Editione *P. Santandreani*, ubi in textu ponitur *Trium Denariûm*, in margine, Trium Millium.

Vide *Antonii Auguſtini* Annotationes ad Feſtum ad vocem *Talentum*, ubi dicit; Mendoſus hic Locus eſt, & qui non patitur Emendationem. Hoc unum certum eſt, Talentorum non unum eſſe Genus, & Atticum eſſe Sex Millium Denariûm. Cætera incerta ſunt.

Vide *Bernardum* de Ponderibus & Menſuris, qui Syracuſanum Talentum dicit eſſe 3000 Denariûm, citátq; Feſtum.

Vide *Dacerii* Notas in Feſtum.

The Opinion which the Dr. would have us entertain of his Great Reading would have been better confirm'd, had he ſupported his Notion of the Low Value of the *Sicilian* Talent by good Authorities taken from approv'd *Sicilian* Writers, or others that purpoſely treat of *Sicilian* Affairs. But, whether the Dr. knows it or not, he had good reaſon to decline the Teſtimony of thoſe, who ſo plainly declare againſt him. For they give us better Grounds for ſetting an higher Price on the *Talent*, by which *Sicilian* Authors us'd to reckon, than *Pollux* and *Feſtus* could give us for placing it ſo low; tho' they had been more expreſs to the Dr's purpoſe than they are.

Dio-

Diodorus a *Sicilian*, writing of *Sicilian* Affairs, frequently uſes the word *Talent*, without any Addition; which therefore, according to the Dr, muſt mean the *Sicilian*: and which yet, by the Circumſtances muſt have as great a Price put upon it, as the *Talents* mention'd by *Phalaris* require. He tells us, that *Agathocles* being poſſeſs'd of a Garriſon of the *Meſſaneans* in *Sicily*, offer'd to ſurrender it to 'em for 30 Talents (*a*). Here a *Sicilian* Writer ſpeaking of a Contract between the Prince of one *Sicilian* Town, and People of another, mentions *Talents*, which muſt be the *Sicilian*, according to Dr. *Bentley*'s Reaſoning; but muſt not be *Sicilian*, according to his Computation. For by his Reckoning, a Garriſon, upon a fair bargain, was to be parted with for leſs than Three pounds: which, if it be true, 'tis probable *Agathocles* got leſs by ſelling his Garriſons, than his Pots.

(*a*) Ἀγαθοκλῆς ὁ τῶν Συρακουσίων δυνάστης κατέσχον ἐρήμην τὴν Μεσσηνίων ἐπηγγείλατο, λαβὼν παρ' αὐτῶν τριάκοντα τάλαντα ἐκχωρήσειν τοῦ τόπου.

Diod. Sic. *l.* 19.

Agen *Diodorus* tells us, that *Gorgias* the famous Rhetorician of *Leontium* (*b*), had One hundred *Minæ* a-piece from his Scholars, (*Sicilian Minæ* they muſt be, according to the Dr.) for teaching 'em his Art. This, tho' taken notice of by the Hiſtorian as an Extraordinary Price, was very inconſiderable Pay (*c*) for ſo great a Maſter; unleſs we may ſuppoſe, that he taught at different Prices, in proportion to

(*b*) Γοργίας ὁ Ῥήτωρ δεινότητι λόγου πολὺ διήνεγκεν παντῶν τῶν καθ' ἑαυτόν· ὃς καὶ πλείστας μὲν τοῖς ἐξεύρει, καὶ περὶ τῶν στρατιώτας τοσούτους τοῖς ἄλλοις ὑφήγαλεν ὥστε μηδὲν λαμβάνειν ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν μνᾶς ἑκατόν. L. 12.

(*c*) *It amounts to* 3 *l.* 1 *d. ob. of our Mony.*

to the Improvements of his Scholars; and then I can allow the Dr. that there is a ſort of Eloquence, which had been too dear a Purchaſe even at that rate.

From the ſame Author we learn (*a*) that the *Syracuſians*, after a ſignal Victory, gave One *Mina* to each of their Subjects, that had behav'd themſelves well in the Fight. The Relator of this is a *Sicilian*: thoſe who give, and thoſe who receive the Reward are *Sicilians* of *Syracuſe*, the very place from whence the Dr's Low Talent had its Denomination: The Perſons honour'd with this Gratuity are ſuch as had diſtinguiſh'd themſelves by their Bravery: and for their Exemplary Courage, and Eminent Service to their Country they are crown'd, and each of them receives, according to the Dr's Eſtimation, the *moiety of Three Farthings*. A Noble Donative! for which no doubt the States were often remember'd by the Souldiery in the beſt Wine of *Syracuſe*.

(*a*) ὡς δ' τὸν μάχην οἱ Συρακόσιοι τὰς μὲν ἐπιλοίπους τῆς ὄπτας ἑκατόμνας, αἵτινες νομίσμαν τῆς νίκης ἐτέθησαν, ἀριστεῦσι δ' ὄντες ἀργυρίε μνᾶν ἕκαστος. L. 11.

Theocritus, another *Sicilian* Writer, in one of his *Idylliums*, mentions both *Mina* and *Drachma*. The Perſons he introduces ſpeaking (*b*) are two *Syracuſian* Ladies; they talk *Doric*,

(*b*)

Γοργώ.

Πρᾳξινόα, μάλα τοι τὸ κατηύνυχες ἀμφίβαμμα
Ἔστ' ὀρθόν· λέγε μοι, πόσσω κατίβα τοι ὁ δῶρος;

Πρᾳξινόα.

Μὰ μάσσης, Γοργοῖ· πολλὸν ἀργυρίω καλάω * μνᾶν
Ἢ δύο.

Idyll. 15.

* *Stephens* in the margin reads μνᾶς.

Doric, the Language of *Syracuse*. The One admires the Others fine Habit, which she had put on upon a Great Festival, to appear at Court in, and asks the Price of it: The Other answers her, that it cost somewhat more than a *Mina* or two; and seems to make an Excuse for her Extravagance: which, if she paid for it in the Dr's Mony, she need not have done, considering they were her Holiday-clothes.

In the same *Idyllium* we have an account of *Five Fleeces* (*) bought for *Seven Drachms*. It is true, we are told it was bad ware: but the Woman had no great Reason to rail at her Husband as a Spendthrift, and an ill Marketman (as we find she doth) if the Whole Purchase fell short of the Eighth Part of a Farthing.

It would be easie, if pardonable, to multiply Instances of this Nature from *Sicilian* Writers, or such as treat of things transacted in *Sicily*. A Neighbouring State (*a*) is by a Bribe of 15 Talents (*b*) prevail'd with to forsake the *Agrigentines*, their Allys. Sixty Talents (*c*) are offer'd by the *Egestans* of *Sicily* for a Months pay (*d*) for 60 Ships, which they had occasion to borrow. *Timoleon* (*e*) the Restorer of *Syracuse* to its Liberties and Rights,

(*a*) Diod. Sic. *l.* 13.

(*b*) *Less than* 30 *Shillings.*

(*c*) Thucyd. p. 353.

(*d*) *A Talent* 1 *l.* 10 *d.* ob. *for a Months pay of a Ship.*

(*e*) Plut. in Vitâ Timoleontis.

(*) Χλωρὰς πωτάεν᾽ ἴκτις ὀθόρνᾳ ἀργυρίν, Δασπλείδας·
Ἔβδα δραχμὰν χιλιάδας, χαλὰν ἐπιλιμὰδα σπῆναι,
Πίντε πόκως ἄλαβ᾽ ἰχθὶς, ἅπαι ῥύπᾳ ——

Rights, was magnificently buried by the State, which he had deliver'd, at the Charge of (*a*) 200 *Minæ*. A vaſt Fund of (*b*) a Thouſand Talents is rais'd by letting out Ground and Houſes to 60000 men, for the Recruit of *Syracuſe*, after it had been ruin'd by a War (*c*). *Dion*'s Eſtate, (*d*) which lay at *Syracuſe*, is reckon'd a Great one; and its full value ſaid to be an *Hundred* (*e*) *Talents*. Two *Sicilian* Princes (*f*) ſend 75 Talents to the *Rhodians* (*g*) for their Relief, after they had been ruin'd by an Earthquake: but could not raiſe ſo great a Sum at once, and therefore ſent it by Parcels. In ſhort, after ſome ſearch into this matter, I am perſwaded no one Inſtance can be produc'd of Talents, or other Moneys mention'd by any *Sicilian* Writer, or any one that writes of *Sicily*, which will countenance or admit of the Low Valuation of the *Sicilian* Talent, that Dr. *Bentley* eſpouſes.

(*a*) 6 *l.* 3 *d.*
(*b*) *Leſs than* 100 *pounds.*
(*c*) Plut. *ibid.*
(*d*) Plato, *Ep.* 7.
(*e*) *Leſs than* 10 *pounds.*
(*f*) Polyb. *p.* 249.
(*g*) *Leſs than* 7 *pounds.*

But becauſe I find the Modern Dealers in ancient Monies go into the Opinion of a *Sicilian* Talent of Low Value, without any other Authority, as I can find, but the obſcure and interpolated Paſſages of *Pollux* and *Feſtus*, I ſhall lay no ſtreſs upon the Exceptions that have been made againſt that Opinion: ſince we may freely admit ſuch a Low Value of this Talent, and yet think

think theſe Letters Genuine. For there might be a Low Value of the *Sicilian* Talent in ſome other Age, and yet the Talent of *Phalaris*'s time might be higher. Or there might be a Talent of this Low Value in other parts of *Sicily*, and yet the Talent of *Agrigentum*, a diſtinct State, might be higher. Or there might be a Low Talent of baſer Metal (*a*), ſuppoſe Braſs, equal to a *Litra*; and yet the *Silver Talents*, which *Phalaris*'s are expreſly ſaid to be (*b*), might be higher. Or there might be a Low Value us'd by the Natives, and ancient Inhabitants of *Sicily*, and the Talent us'd by the *Greek Colonies* that plac'd themſelves there, might be higher. Or if in *Phalaris*'s time there was a Silver Talent of this Low Value of uſe among the Greek Colonies, at *Agrigent* and elſewhere, yet the Reaſons that may be offer'd for *Phalaris*'s uſing the *Attic* Dialect (to ſpeak looſely) tho' a *Sicilian*, will juſtifie his reckoning the Talents, as the *Athenians* did. Or if theſe Letters might by a Later hand be chang'd out of the *Doric* Dialect into the *Attic*, the ſame hand might make 'em ſpeak *Attic*, in the valuation of the Monies. All theſe Suppoſitions muſt be ſhewn impoſſible, before any convincing Argument can be drawn from hence, to prove theſe Letters Spurious. Or Laſtly, tho' none of theſe Reaſonings ſhould hold, 'tis agreed by thoſe, who treat of

(*a*) *The Talents in* Pollux, *being compar'd to* χαλκοῦς, *and being, according to the preſent reading of* Pollux, *lower in Value than They, ſeem to be Braſs rather than Silver.*

(*b*) Epp. 118, 95.

of theſe matters (*a*), and give us this low Value of the *Sicilian Talent*, that wherever the Word *Talent* is us'd by Greek Writers, without any addition, the *Attic Talent* muſt be underſtood. So far are the Learned from thinking, as the Dr. doth, that *Phalaris*, *had he made uſe of the Attic Account, ſhould always have given expreſs notice of it; and never have ſaid* τάλαντον *alone, without the addition of* Ἀττικὸν. For They, who were converſant in other Books beſide Dictionaries were ſenſible, that *Sicilian* Writers frequently us'd the Word *Talent* in the Attic ſenſe of it, without any ſuch expreſs Limitation. And if Other *Sicilian* Authors might expreſs themſelves in this manner, without being ſuſpected as Spurious, *Phalaris* is unjuſtly ſuſpected by the Dr. on this account. As to this head, he ſtands or falls, with the reſt of his Countrymen: and I doubt not but the Reader, upon a fair and impartial View of what has been ſaid to This Article of Dr. *Bentley*'s Indictment againſt *Phalaris*, will pronounce him *Not Guilty*.

(*a*) Talentum ſine adjectione Scriptoribus antiquis paſſim pro Attico. *Gronov.* de Pec. Vet. *l.* 3.

Talentum Atticum propriè τάλαντον in ſcriptis Græcis Latiniſque. *Bernard.* in Ep. ad Pocock.

Semper in Auctoribus (præter Sacros) ubi Nomen *Talenti* occurrit, hoc ipſum (*Atticum*, 6000 Drachmarum *Atticarum*) intelligendum eſt, ſi Nomen Talenti abſolutè poſitum ſit, neq; diſtinctionis causâ aliquid adjiciatur. *Brerewood* de Num. *p.* 27.

HE

HItherto Dr. *Bentley* has kept himſelf pretty well within his Province, and criticis'd chiefly upon Words and Phraſes and Dialects; in his *next General Proof* he ventures to criticiſe upon *Things*, and to ſhew the Letters an Impoſture, from the *Matter and Buſineſs* of 'em *. *They are a Fardle of Common Places* (he ſays) *without any Life or Spirit from Action and Circumſtance: When You come to 'em*, YOU FIND BY THE EMPTINESS AND DEADNESS OF THEM, THAT YOU CONVERSE WITH A DREAMING PEDANT, WITH HIS ELBOW ON HIS DESK; *not with an active ambitious Tyrant, with his Hand on his Sword*, &c. *All that takes or affects You is a Stiffneſs, and Stateliveſs, and Operoſeneſs of Style*, &c. *which is quite aliene from the Character of* Phalaris, *a Man of Buſineſs and Diſpatch* †.

* Differt. p. 55.

† Differt. p. 62, 63.

Stiffneſs, and Statelineſs, and Operoſeneſs of Style, is indeed *quite aliene from the Character of a Man of Buſineſs and Diſpatch*: for which reaſon, any body that reads Dr. *Bentley* would eaſily gueſs, that he is not *a Man of Buſineſs*. And not being a Man of Buſineſs, but a *Library-keeper*, it is not overmodeſtly done of him, to oppoſe his Judgment and Taſte in this caſe to that of Sir *William Temple*; who is certainly a Man of Buſineſs, and knows more of theſe things, than Dr. *Bentley* does of *Heſychius* and *Suidas*. For, as his Friend Mr. *Wotton* has with Great Sagacity obſerv'd, *It is Univerſally acknowledg'd, that He who has ſtudied any Subject is a better Judge of that Subject*,

jest, than another Man who did never purposely bend his Thoughts that way; provided they be both Men of Equal Parts *. Sir *William Temple* has spent a good part of his Life in transacting Affairs of State; He has written to Kings, and They to Him: and this has qualified him to judge how Kings should write, much better than all Dr. *Bentley's* Correspondence with *Foreign Professors*; especially if they be such Professors, as have the Judgment to admire Him and His *Humanity*. I shall not therefore offer a Word on the General Part of this Head, in Justification of the Epistles: I shall barely set down the Passage in which Sir *William Temple* expresses his Sense of this matter; and shall then leave it to the Reader, whose Opinion he'll think fit to take, either *His*, or the *Library-keeper's* at St. *James's*. Sir *William's* admirable Words are, *I think he must have but little skill in Painting, that cannot find out this to be an Original. Such Diversity of Passions upon such Variety of Actions, and Passages of Life and Government; such Freedom of Thought, such Boldness of Expression; such Bounty to his Friends, such Scorn of his Enemies; such Honour of Learned Men, such Esteem of Good; such Knowledge of Life, such Contempt of Death, with such Fierceness of Nature, and Cruelty of Revenge, could never be represented but by Him that possess'd 'em. And I esteem* Lucian *to have been no more capable of Writing them of Aelian, as* Phalaris *did. In all One writ You find the Scholar, or the Sophist; and in all the Other writ, the Tyrant and the Commander.* It is plain, Sir *William Temple* does not write *like a Dreaming Pedant, with his Elbow on his Desk*; and there-

* Reflect. upon ancient and modern Learning, p. 20.

therefore the Reader perhaps will be apt to take his Judgment, when he tells him, that *Phalaris* does not write like one neither.

I cannot but obſerve, that Dr. *Bentley* is here and elſewhere (*a*) very Liberal in diſtributing the Reproach of *Pedantry*; which is to Me, I confeſs, a plain Proof that he has no juſt Notions of it: for if he had, it is ſo high an Offence againſt Good Manners, and Good Senſe, that methinks he ſhould impute it more ſparingly. I will endeavour therefore to ſet him right; which perhaps I ſhall be the better able to do, becauſe having convers'd much a late with ſome Writings, where this Beauty of Style prevails, I have very ſtrong and ſenſible Impreſſions of it.

(*a*) *Thoſe Little* Pedants, *that have ſtalkt about in the Apparel of Heroes.* Diſſert. *p.* 29.

—— *that wretched* Pedantry *in the matter*, p. 65.

—— *affected to excel each other, even to* Pedantry. *p.* 41, &c.

PEDANTRY is a Word of a very various and mix'd meaning, and therefore hard to be Defin'd: but I will Deſcribe it to the Dr. as well as I can, by pointing out ſome of the Chief *Marks and Moles* of it.

The Firſt and ſureſt Mark of a *Pedant* is, to write without obſerving the receiv'd Rules of Civility, and Common Decency: and without diſtinguiſhing the Characters of Thoſe he writes to, or againſt: For Pedantry in the Pen, is what Clowniſhneſs is in Converſation; it is *Written Illbreeding.*

It is *Pedantry*, to affect the uſe of an Hard Word, where there is an Eaſie one; or of a Greek or Latin Word, where there is an Engliſh one, that ſignifies the very ſame thing.

thing. And theſe Two Meanings of the Word my Lord *Roſcommon* ſeems to have hinted in thoſe fine Verſes of his; which are worth at leaſt half a dozen Pages of Dr. *Bentley's Scraps* of *Callimachus*, Notes and all.

The Soil intended for Pierian *Seeds*
Muſt be well purg'd from rank Pedantic *Weeds:*
Apollo *ſtarts, and all* Parnaſſus *ſhakes*
At the rude Rumbling Baralipton *makes.*
For none were e'er with Admiration read,
But Who, beſide their Learning, were well bred.
Eſſ. on Tranſl. Verſe.

How Dr. *Bentley* will, on theſe Articles, excuſe his Familiar Treatment of Sir *William Temple* (a), and his Courſe Complements to Me (b); how he will bring off his Greek and Latin Proverbs (c), his *aliene*, and *negoci*, and *concede*, and *repudiating a Vernacular Idiom*, with an Hundred other ſuch Elegances of Speech, I leave him to conſider at his Leiſure.

(a) *Could neither diſcover the true Time, nor true Value of his Authors.* p. 6.
—— *Criticiſm of a* Peculiar Complexion, *and muſt proceed from a Singularity of Palate and Judgment.* P. 7.

(b) Sorry Critic, Bungling Tinker, Lucian's *Aſs*, &c.

(c) ἀλλὰ κρανὰ νὺ πλέμε, Aſinus ad Lyram, &c.

To over-rate the Price of Knowledge, and to make as great ado about the true Rendring of a Phraſe, or Accenting of a Word, as if an Article of Faith, or the Fortune of a Kingdom depended upon it, is *Pedantry*. And ſo is an Aſſuming and Poſitive way of delivering ones ſelf, upon Points eſpecially not worth our Concern, and not capable of being perfectly clear'd: and whether Dr. *Bentley* be guilty in this reſpect or no, the Reader will be

be able to judge, when he has caſt his Eye on the Margin, and conſider'd, how many times the Dr. in his Diſſertation, has freely us'd the Word *Demonſtrate* of his own Performances (*a*): and withal, how fond he is of *Negatives*, (a very dangerous way of Speech!) and that in Caſes oftentimes where the Contrary Affirmative is moſt certainly true; as it is, and ſhall be prov'd to be, in all thoſe Inſtances, which this Mark † refers to.

(*a*) —*even* Demonſtrated, *that the Epiſtles of* Phal. *are Spurious.* P. 5.

— *that* Demonſtrate Anaxilaus *to have liv'd* — P. 26.
— Demonſtrate *the Doric Dialect to have been*, &c. P. 42.
— *But which is plain* Demonſtration, P. 48.
— *Will* Demonſtrate *'em by and by to be an Impoſture.* P. 116.
— *I ſhall* Demonſtrate *ours to be of a modern date.* P. 138.
— *is a* Demonſtrative *Proof.* P. 141.

† *There was* no ſuch thing as Tragedy *while he tyranniz'd at* Agrigentum. P. 40.

ne'er never *us'd by the Ancients in that ſenſe.* P. 52.

By that time I have done with 'em, it will be no more *a Controverſie, whether they are Spurious.* P. 89.

There is No MS. *above CCC Years old, that has the Fables according to that Copy.* P. 146.

In all that Tract of Time, not one Single *Author, that has given us the* Leaſt Hint *that Æſop was* Ugly. P. 249.

Aſtypalæa, *a City in* Crete, *never mention'd by any Geographer.* P. 44.

A Diſcovery in Geography, that could not *be learnt any where elſe.* P. 58.

Euſtathius, *who* appears never *to have ſeen the true* Athenæus. P. 20.

To depart from the Common Ways of Writing or Speaking, and ſuch as have been us'd by the beſt Pens, on purpoſe to ſhew ones ſelf more Exact and Knowing than the Reſt of the World, is a Piece of Affectation, that ſavours of *Pedantry*. *Tauromenium* is the word that is generally us'd by both Ancient and

and Modern Writers. Dr. *Bentley* has reform'd our Spelling, and will have it *Tauromimium*, because *Pliny*, and *Solinus*, (and perhaps somebody else) have happen'd to call it so. And here I must beg the Reader's Excuse, if I go a little out of the Way, to do right to Sir *William Temple*, in a Case of the Like nature: Mr. *Wotton* tells him, with great Plainness of Speech, that *He, of all men, ought not to have arraign'd the Modern Ignorance in Grammar, who puts* Delphos *for* Delphi, *every where in his Essays* *: A Capital Mistake, and worthy to be chastis'd by the Acute Pen of Mr. *Wotton*! But is he sure that putting *Delphos* for *Delphi* is an Offence against Grammar? I thought always, that what was according to Propriety, and the receiv'd Use of a Tongue, could not be against Grammar. It may indeed be against some General Rule of Grammar: but so Wise a Man as Mr. *Wotton* is, should have known, that Grammar has not only *General Rules*, but *Particular Exceptions* too; and that the Common Custom and Usage of a Tongue is capable of creating an Exception at any time; and is as good a Rule as any in the Grammar. Now *Delphos*, for the Latin Word *Delphi*, is us'd by all the finest Writers of our Tongue, and best Judges of it: particularly, by Mr. *Waller* twice, in some of his Last Copies (*a*); which, tho' they are worse Poetry than the rest, yet are in Correcter English: by Mr. *Dryden*, four or five times, in his Life of *Plutarch* (*b*); by Mr. *Duke* (*c*), and Mr. *Creech* (*d*) often in their several Lives of *Theseus*, and *Solon*: and (be-

* Reflect. upon anc. and mod. Learning, p. 59.

(*a*) P. 269, 263.

(*b*) P. 6, 33, 41, 46, 48.
(*c*) P. 4, 20, 23, 36, 42, 59.
(*d*) P. 280, 288, 310.

(becauſe perhaps One Old Divine may weigh more with Mr. *Wotton* than all theſe Modern Witneſſes) by the Reverend and Learned Dr. *Jackſon*, in his Volumes on the Creed (*a*). Mr. *Wotton* might have ſaid indeed, that *Delphos*, in the Singular Number, is not Good *Latin*, or Good *Greek*: but when he ſays, 'tis *bad Engliſh*, he only ſhews, that he does not converſe with ſo Good Authors as he ought to do. This Digreſſion might have been ſpar'd, but that Mr. *Wotton*, when he was purging his Book of ſome unbecoming Paſſages in a ſecond Edition of it, thought fit ſtill to retain this Grammatical Reflection there: perhaps in a third Edition, he'l take care that This too ſhall bear the reſt Company.

(*a*) T. 2. P. 364.

Dr. *Bentley* will forgive me this ſhort Viſit to his *Friend*, now I return to him.

Pedantry conſiſts alſo in *Low* and *Mean* ways of Speech, which are a Vicious Affectation of what is Natural and Eaſie, as Hard Words are of Learning and Scholarſhip. And whether Dr. *Bentley* has not offended this way, by thoſe Familiar Expreſſions of *Mother Clito the Herbwoman*, and *Going to Pott*, and *ſetting Horſes together*, and *Roaſting the Old Woman*, and by his apt Simile drawn from *Bungling Tinkers mending old Kettles*; any-body, but Pedants, can tell.

An Itch of contradicting Great Men, or Eſtabliſh'd Opinions upon very ſlight Grounds, is another Inſtance of *Pedantry*: and (not to mention any thing that relates to the Preſent Diſpute) ſomething of this kind there was, I'm afraid, in Dr. *Bentley*'s brisk Cenſure of

Grotius and *Scaliger* for not knowing the meaſure of an *Anapeſtic* Verſe (*a*), when 'tis plain (as I ſhall ſhew, before I lay down my Pen (*b*), that the Dr. would never have cenſur'd 'em, if he had known it himſelf (*c*). *Caſtelvetro*, an Italian Pedant, was famous for ſuch a Snarling Faculty as this; *He was* (as *Balzac* ſays very well of him (*d*)) *a Public Enemy, that could not endure any-body ſhould have Merit, or Reputation, but himſelf.*

(*a*) *Bentl.* Pp. ad Millium in fine Malalæ, *p.* 26.

(*b*) *In the Article of the* Thericlean *Cups.*

(*c*) Modeſtè & circumſpectè de tantis Viris pronuntiandum eſt, ne fortè (quod pleriſque accidit) damnent quæ non intelligunt. *Quint.*

(*d*) Ceſtoit une Enemie Public, qui ne pouvoit ſouffrir le merite, ni la reputation de perſonne. *L.* 5, *Lettr.* 5.

The Subject is fruitful; but I will confine my ſelf to one Particular more of the *Pedant*'s Character; and that is, a Love of Quoting Books, or Paſſages not extant, or never ſeen by him; in order to amaze and confound his poor Reader, and make himſelf Terrible in the Way of Learning. *As* Ariſtotle *ſays in his Loſt Treatiſe of the* Sicilian *Government*, ſays the Dr *; tho' that Treatiſe be ſo far *loſt*, that *Ariſtotle* did really never write it. And again he tells us, what Monſieur *de Meziriac* has done in his Life of *Æſop* (*e*), and yet owns in the very next Line, that he *never* met with this Book, but only *gueſs'd* what was in it. He produces (*f*) *the Unknown Authors* Diodorus *tranſcrib'd*, as ſo many Witneſſes on his ſide: and, in another place (*g*), he gives a very particular account of what *A. Gellius* ſaid in a *Loſt Chapter*; not from any other Writer that had quoted it, but meerly by dint of Conjecture.

* Differt. *p.* 55.

(*e*) P. 135.

(*f*) P. 26.

(*g*) P. 28.

Theſe

These are all the *Marks and Moles of Pedantry* that I can now ſtay to point out to the Dr: if he be ſtill at a loſs to know what the Pedant's Character is, and where to apply it; I referr him to a Paſſage in *Bruyere* (*a*), where I think this matter is very ſuccinctly and fully handl'd. *There are*, ſays he, *in Learning, as in War, a ſort of Inferiour and Subaltern Officers; Men, who ſeem made only for Regiſters and Magazines to ſtore up the Productions of better Writers. Collectors they are, Tranſcribers, Plagiaries; They never Think, themſelves; they tell You only what Others have thought before them. They heap together Matter in abundance, without Choice or Diſtinction; and care not how Worthleſs it is, ſo there be but Enough on't. They Know nothing, but juſt as they learn it from their Books; and Learn nothing but what every-body elſe deſires to be Ignorant of. They have a Vain, Dry, Inſipid ſort of Knowledge; that is Diſagreeable, and Uſeleſs; can neither enliven Converſation, nor conduce to Buſineſs. We are ſometimes ſurpriz'd at their Reading, but always tir'd with their Diſcourſe, or their Writings. These are They, who among All the Little Men, and Some Great Ones, go for Scholars; but among the Wiſe and Senſible part of Mankind, for* Pedants.

(*a*) Les Caract. ou les Mœurs de ce Siecle. Chap. des Ouvrages de l' Eſprit.

This Account of *Pedantry* has drawn me a little out of my Way; I ſhall now return again into it, and conſider the Particular Inſtances Dr. *Bentley* has brought to juſtifie his General Aſſertion, that the *Matter and Buſineſs* of the Letters betrays 'em not to be Genuine.

* P. 56. The firſt is *an Improbable and Abſurd Story* * (as he thinks) about *Steſichorus*; who dying at *Catana*, the *Himereans* deſir'd to have his Aſhes brought back into his Native City *Himera*; but the *Cataneans* would not part with them. This occaſion'd a fierce Conteſt between the two Towns, which *Phalaris* appeas'd, by prevailing with the *Himereans* to let *Steſichorus*'s Aſhes ſleep in Peace at *Catana*, and build a Temple to the Honour of him, at Home. Now what is there in this Story either *Abſurd*, or *Improbable?* that the *Himereans* ſhould be ſo concern'd to get the Aſhes of *Steſichorus*, and the *Cataneans* to keep them? This very thing happen'd afterwards in the caſe of *Euripides*; whoſe Bones the *Athenians* ſent a ſolemn Embaſſy to *Macedonia*, to retrieve, as *A. Gellius* informs us (*a*); and that, not in *a Loſt Chapter*. And after the Denial of this Requeſt, we learn from *Pauſanias* (*b*), that the *Athenians* built a Noble Monument to the Memory of *Euripides*, which continu'd even to His Time. Somewhat of the ſame Honour was paid to *Heſiod*'s Remains; which being buried, where *Heſiod* was murder'd, a great way off *Aſcra*, the *Orchomenians*, *Plutarch* tells us (*c*), endeavour'd all they could to get 'em into their poſſeſſion, but They that had 'em, would not be prevail'd upon to part with 'em. And if *Euripides* and *Heſiod* were honour'd with ſuch Contentions as theſe, after their Deaths, why might not *Steſichorus?*

(*a*) L. 15, C. 20.

(*b*) L. 1, P. 2.

(*c*) Conv. Sap. *p.* 162.

Ay, but ſays the Dr, *a Temple, and Deification, were a little too Extravagant an Honour to be paid to a Poet's Memory* (*d*). I thought ſuch things as theſe could not have ſurpriz'd a man

(*d*) Diſſer. *p.* 57.

man of the Dr's *Polymathy*: but, I find, he knows nothing of the ſeveral *Temples* erected to *Homer*, at *Smyrna*, and in other places; as *Strabo* (*a*), and *Ælian* (*b*) expreſly affirm: nor ſo much as remembers that Known Paſſage in *Tully*'s Oration *pro Archiâ Poetâ*, which is no Secret even to the Firſt Beginners in Learning. Homerum (ſays he) Smyrnæi *ſuum eſſe confirmant*: itaq; *etiam* Delubra *Ejus in Oppido collocaverunt*. From whence alſo Dr. *Bentley* may pleaſe to learn the reaſon, why *Phalaris* would have the *Himereans* content themſelves with erecting a Temple to *Steſichorus*, becauſe That would declare to Poſterity, that he was Born there (*c*).

(*a*) L. 14. p. 646.
(*b*) Var. Hiſt. *l.* 13, *c.* 23.
(*c*) *Smyrna Homerum* Vatem ſibi oſtentans.

vendicabat; Sepulcrum, *Templum*, & Statuas ipſius *Varro*.

Nay, it happens a little unluckily, that an Ancient *Marble* is preſerv'd to this Day, (which perhaps belong'd to ſome Temple erected to the Honour of *Homer*, in ſome of the places that contended for his Birth) where the *Apotheoſis*, or Deification of that Poet is deſcrib'd; and a Learned Man, *Cuperus*, has writ a Large Comment upon it: which methinks the Dr. ſhould have been acquainted with, tho' he be not *a Foreign Profeſſor*.

E're I quit this Particular, I muſt obſerve a Little Slip of the Dr's, in telling us, that *Himera* in *Tully*'s time was call'd *Therma* *. I believe it was not; becauſe *Tully* himſelf aſſures us, that *Himera* and *Thermæ* were two Different Towns; and the Latter built at ſome Diſtance from the Ruines of the For-

* Diſſert. p. 57.

mer (*a*). And, without this Diſtinction, between *Himera* and *Therme* 'tis impoſſible to underſtand *Diodorus*, where he ſays, that after *Himera* was ſack'd and ras'd by the *Carthaginians*, it continu'd altogether uninhabited, even to His Days (*b*): which could not be True, if *Himera* and *Therme* were the ſame; for, that *Therma* was well inhabited in *Diodorus*'s time, is paſt Diſpute. I will not deny, but that ſome careleſs Paſſages may perhaps have dropp'd from the Pens of Old Authors, where theſe Two are not nicely diſtinguiſh'd: but it is not in Works, where they ſet up for being ſevere upon other Mens Miſtakes; and Their want of Exactneſs therefore may be forgiven them. But Dr. *Bentley*, who profeſſes to give no Quarter, ſhould take care not to want any.

(*a*) Himerâ deletâ, quos Cives belli Calamitas reliquos fecerat, ii ſeſe *Thermis* collocarant, in ejuſdem agri finibus, neq; longè ab Oppido antiquo. *Or. 7. in Verr.*

(*b*) Τῆς πόλεως ὑπὸ Καρχηδονίων χειρωθείσης, καὶ κατασκαφείσης, διέμεινεν ἀοίκητος μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς καιρῶν. L. 11, p. 38.

His Laſt Objection happily aroſe from contemplating the Matter of One Single Epiſtle, the Dr. will now compare the Epiſtles together, and confute One by another. There is an *Inconſiſtency*, he ſays, *between the* LI^ſt *and the* LXIXth, *becauſe in the* LI^ſt Phalaris's *Wife is Dead, and in the* LXIXth *She is Alive again* *. As if it were neceſſary that theſe Epiſtles ſhould have been written juſt in the ſame Order that they ſtand; which is different in the Printed Copies from what it is in the MSS, and different in one MS from what

* P. 57.

what it is in another. Upon ſuch an unreaſonable Suppoſition as this, how many *Inconſiſtencies* might be found in *Tully*'s Epiſtles? or even in Thoſe of St. *Paul?* And yet, if this Suppoſition do not take place, there is no manner of *Inconſiſtency* between theſe Two Epiſtles of *Phalaris*. The Penetrating Dr. *Bentley* ſeems to have had ſome Suſpicions, that this Argument was of it ſelf a little too weak to ſtand its Ground; and therefore has back'd it with a ſtrong Reſerve of Four Other Suppoſitions: and if All Theſe hold good, he will ſtill prove the Epiſtles Spurious. Firſt he *ſuppoſes*, that *Erythia* was poiſon'd by *Python*, *not long after* Phalaris's *Baniſhment*; becauſe otherwiſe, he *ſuppoſes*, ſhe *could not want Opportunities to follow him:* then he *ſuppoſes*, Erythia *was poiſon'd in the Iſland* Aſtypalæa, where he *ſuppoſes*, that *her Poiſoner dwelt*. Here's more *Poſtulatums* than *Euclid* requir'd to build the Whole Body of his Elements upon; and yet He muſt be very kind to Dr. *Bentley*, that will grant him any One of them; ſince there is nothing either in the Epiſtles themſelves, or in any Other Hiſtory I have had the Luck to meet with, that can give 'em the leaſt Countenance. At preſent therefore I take the ſame Liberty, to deny every one of theſe Suppoſitions, as He has to aſſume them: If hereafter he can prove them in another Language, 'twill then be time enough to ſhew, that they are *Nothing to the Purpoſe*.

In ſome Other Epiſtles, the Dr. has diſcover'd a *Scene of Putid and Senſleſs Formality* *. A Man of Quality in *Syracuſe*, whoſe Wife

* Diſſert. p. 58.

was lately Dead, ſends his Brother to *Phalaris*, with a Requeſt, that he would endeavour to prevail with *Steſichorus* to write an Elegy upon Her: *Phalaris* trys, and prevails; but is not ſo ſucceſsful in a ſecond Attempt of the ſame Nature, that he makes at the Inſtance of another *Sicilian* Gentleman. I proteſt, I can ſee no Harm in all this: there may indeed, for ought I know, be *Putid Formality* in it, becauſe I can't well tell what thoſe Hard Words mean; but I ſee nothing Unnatural there, or Misbecoming the Character of *Phalaris*. No! ſays the Dr, what? *can any One believe that ſuch Stuff as this buſied the Head of the Tyrant* *? As Low thoughts as the Dr. has of the *Epiſtles*, I find he has very high ones of *Phalaris*: he ſeems to have repreſented him to himſelf, as ſome Mighty Monarch, that had Vaſt Dominions, and was too Great and too Buſie, to attend ſuch Trifles: whereas He was only a Petty Prince of One Town in *Sicily*: and, as ſuch, I hope, the Office here given him was no ways below him. Indeed the Dr. has, for the Honour of *Phalaris*, repreſented that Town as exceeding *Populous*; for *Diodorus*, he ſays, counts 200000 Souls in *Agrigent*, and Others 800000 †. *Diodorus* I grant, in the place cited, ſays, there were ſuch Numbers in it, when the *Carthaginians* took it, *Olymp.* LXXXXIII. 3; when (as he tells us in the ſame place) it was in its moſt proſperous and flouriſhing Eſtate: but muſt there needs be as many Inhabitants in it, 150 Years before, in the Reign of *Phalaris*? As for his Other Witneſs *Laertius*, his 800:00 are given up by the

* Diſſert. p. 59.

† Diſſert. p. 58.

the Learned, as a Groſs Miſtake; which *Bochart* ſuppoſes to have riſen from the change of a Numeral K into a Π: or however that may be, the Account, he ſays, is *incredible, and utterly falſe* *. Incredible as it is, the Dr. vouchſafes to take up with it; and it grows under his Hands; for by that time we are got to the End of this Article, theſe 800000 are *a Million of Subjects* †: the 200000 are thrown in careleſly to make it a Round Number. Let it be a *Million*, yet there have been Tyrants, with *many Millions* of Subjects at their Command, who have thought fit to employ and entertain themſelves much after this manner. Has the Dr. who deals ſo much in *Fragments*, never ſeen thoſe of *Auguſtus*'s Letters to *Horace?* has he never heard, that we owe the *Fourth Book of* Horace's *Odes*, and the fineſt of all his *Epiſtles*, to that Prince's Importunity, who preſs'd, and oblig'd him to write, and to make mention of *Him* in his Poems? And *ſuch Stuff*, I preſume, may very well be allow'd to buſie *Phalaris*'s *Head*, which found room in the Thoughts of *Auguſtus*.

* Cùm res planè ſuperat fidem adeóque ſit falſiſſima. *Phaleg.* p. 553.

† Differt. p. 58.

But why ſo much ado? ſays Our Keen Obſerver; could not the *Syracuſian* have written to Steſichorus, *and at the price of ſome Preſent met with Succeſs* *? I agree with the Dr. that *a Preſent* is ſometimes an Expeditious Method of doing Buſineſs; I have known ſeveral things in my Life-time *ſtick* for want of it. However here it was Improper: for *Steſichorus* was not only the Greateſt Poet, but one of the Greateſt Men in *Sicily*. His Brother

* Differt. p. 60.

ther *Helianax* was a Lawgiver [Νομοθέτης] *Suidas* tells us; and He himſelf probably in the Government of *Himera*; or at leaſt conſulted by 'em in Extraordinary Caſes, as appears by his Apologue in *Ariſtotle*'s Rhetoric: And the true way of prevailing with ſuch a man to employ his excellent Pen was to offer him not Mony, but a Subject that deſerv'd it. Some of his Brother Poets indeed were to be tempted this way: but they were Men of Mean Birth, and Education; and were to make their Fortunes by their Pen; and no wonder therefore that they were Mercenary.

It is objected, that if theſe Letters about the *Elegy* were *Phalaris*'s, he would have expreſs'd himſelf properly, and not have *call'd the ſame Copy of Verſes* μέλος, *and* ἆσμα, *which are as different from one another as* Theognis *is from* Pindar (*a*): *an Egregious Piece of Dulneſs!* ſays the Dr; and which proves him to be a meer *Aſinus ad Lyram!* Now, to ſee the different Caſt of Mens Heads, allowing the Error in this caſe, ſo *Egregiouſly Dull* am I, that I ſhould have reaſon'd, juſt the other way, from it; that if *a Sophiſt* had writ theſe Letters, he would never have confounded theſe Two Words, the diſtinct Senſe of which was ſo well ſettl'd before his Time by the Grammarians. But in *Phalaris*'s time the meaning of theſe Terms of Art might not be ſo ſtrictly mark'd out; or *a Prince* might not think himſelf oblig'd to take notice of it, and to write with all the Exactneſs of a Scholar. So that from this very Miſtake, if it were one, I ſhould have inferr'd ſomething

(*a*) Diſſer. *p.* 59.

in

favor of the Letters: but, to our Misfortune, here is no Miſtake. *Phalaris* did but as a Nicer Man than He might have done; he calls the Poem Ἐλεγεῖον (*a*), when he asks it of *Steſichorus*, and did not know in what Verſe it would be compos'd by him; and he calls it μέλος afterwards (*b*), when he had it, and found it was in Lyric Meaſures. Ἔλεγος and Ἐλεγεῖον originally ſignified only a Mournful or Funeral Song (*c*); an *Elegy*, as we ſay in *Engliſh*: referring to the Subject of the Song, and not to the Meaſure. But *Elegies* being generally writ in *Hexameters*, and *Pentameters*, the Word came afterwards to be apply'd purely to the *Meaſure*, without any Regard to the *Subject*. However this Second Senſe of the Word did not ſo far prevail, as abſolutely to extinguiſh the Firſt; ſtill Ἔλεγος and Ἐλεγεῖον were now and then employ'd in a Looſer Meaning than what the Grammarians put upon 'em; and of this I will give the Dr. one plain Inſtance, from a Darling Author of his, *Dion Chryſoſtome*, who in his 4th Book *de Regno* calls the *Heroic Verſes* written on *Sardanapalus*'s Tomb, Ἐλεγεῖον: And *Ariſtophanes* ſpeaking of the *Nightingale*, has this Paſſage:

(*a*) Ep. 144.

(*b*) Ep. 79.

(*c*) —Elegeïa, flebile Carmen:
Ah! nimis ex vero nunc tibi nomen habes!
Ovid.

Καὶ οἱ Ἑλληνικοὶ ἢ ἔλεγοι, ἃ ἔστι θρήνοι οἱ μετ' αὐλοῦ, φασὶν, ᾠδαὶ· πάνθημον δὲ ἦν τὸ σῶμα, φασὶν, ὁ αὐλός· Euſt. in Hom. Il. Ω. paulò ante finem.

φοῖβος ἀλύων ταῖς σαῖς ἐλέγοις
Ἀπολλάλει· In Ὄρνιθ.

Where ἐλέγοις can ſignifie nothing, but a *Melancholy*

lancholy Tune, or *Mournful Song* (*a*); unleſs our Grammarian can prove, that the Nightingales in that part of the World ſung in Elegiac Meaſure. And the Misfortune of it is, that theſe very Ἔλεγοι are call'd μέλη but a few Verſes before.

(*a*) *Accordingly the* Scholiaſt *thus interprets it.* Τοῖς σοῖς ἐλεγείοις, ἀντὶ τῶν τοῖς θρηνώδεσι. Ἔστιν δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐλεγεῖν.

Τὸν ἐμὸν δ' οὐκ ἔστιν πολύδακρυν Ἴτυν
Ἐλελιζομένη διεροῖς μέλεσιν.

And I hope *Ariſtophanes* underſtood Greek, and was no *Aſinus ad Lyram*. As ſtrong Proofs as theſe may ſeem, I have ſtill behind One Authority more, which will go farther with Dr. *Bentley* than any I have yet brought: 'tis his Own. He, *p.* 139, of his Diſſertation, tells us, that Some-body made an *Edition of Æſop's Fables in Elegiac Verſe*; and after giving us ſeveral Inſtances of the kind, he adds, that *Some of Them*, (*i. e.* of the Elegiac Fables) *were all in Hexameters* (*b*). I'd adviſe him therefore to call in this Criticiſm, and his Dirty Proverb along with it, for fear it ſhou'd ſtick where he has not a mind it ſhould.

(*b*) Diſſer. *p.* 140.

He has ſtill One way left of diſproving this *Piece of Putid Formality*; and that is, by denying that *Steſichorus* and *Phalaris* were acquainted (*c*). 'Tis a Negative, and therefore pretty hard to be made out; let us ſee how he ſets about it. He obſerves, that *Lucian* ſays nothing of this Acquaintance. *Lucian* mentions it not by Name indeed; but he ſpeaks in General of *Phalaris*'s Converſation with Learned Men, and their great Eſteem of him; and then gives an Inſtance in *Pythagoras*,

(*c*) Ibid. *p.* 60.

rus, the moſt celebrated Scholar of his Time (*a*); and after Him, there needed no other Inſtances. Had a Leſs Skilful Hand been employ'd in making this Oration, he would probably have heap'd up all he knew of *Phalaris*, and overacted his part by too Great and Circumſtantial a Nicety. But *Lucian* had more Art; he knew when to leave off, that the Piece might not look ſtiff and unnatural. Beſides, if *Lucian*'s Silence be an Exception to *Steſichorus*'s acquaintance with *Phalaris*, it is to *Abaris*'s too; which yet Our Critic has before, for the ſake of *Ariſtotle* and *Jamblichus* (*b*), been graciouſly pleas'd to allow.

(*a*) Ἔφασι δὲ καὶ ἐξενεγκεῖν δὲ φοιτῶσι πρὸ ἐμοῦ οἱ σοφισταὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, καὶ ὁ σεύχρυσος τῶν συμποσίων ἐμοὶ ὥσπερ ἀμύητος καὶ ἀρρύητος ὁ Σοφὸς Πυθαγόρας ἦλθεν ὡς ἡμᾶς, &c.

Luc. Phal. 1.

(*b*) Diſſer. p. 15.

But *Plato* is ſilent, as well as *Lucian*, in this matter; and that in an Epiſtle written to a Tyrant of *Sicily*, where he *is reckoning up the Friendſhips of Learned Men with Tyrants and Magiſtrates* (*c*). Neither has *Plato* mention'd any thing in that Epiſtle of the acquaintance between *Phalaris* and *Pythagoras*; which had been as Proper, and as *Domeſtic* an Inſtance as the other. And yet the *Pythagoreans* all agree that their Maſter and *Phalaris* were acquainted; and Dr. *Bentley* grants it: why ſhould *Plato*'s Ill Memory be a proof againſt the one, and no proof againſt the other? But I rather think, it was his Good Judgment, than his Ill Memory, that occaſion'd this Omiſſion: *Phalaris*'s Name was deteſted and infamous in *Sicily*; and to have brought him in therefore among his other Inſtances, would

(*c*) Ibid. p. 62.

have

have ſpoil'd the Complement to *Dionyſius*, who might like well enough to have the Parallel drawn between Him and *Hiero*, or *Pericles*, or *Periander*, or *Craſus*; but would not have thought it a Civility, I believe, to have been compar'd with *Phalaris*: whoſe Character, when taken at the beſt, and as drawn in theſe Epiſtles, is not ſo Amiable, as that any man ſhould be pleas'd with reſembling him; eſpecially One, who could not but be conſcious to himſelf, that he had made uſe of His Methods, and had reaſon to expect His Fate. *Plato* was a Great Maſter of Decency; and he never ſhew'd it more than in this dextrous management, which I am not ſurpriz'd to find that our Library-keeper has no Reliſh of.

His laſt Argument is from *Pindar*, who ſpeaks of *Phalaris*'s Cruelty with Deteſtation. And what follows from thence? that he never heard of *his Extraordinary Dearneſs with Steſichorus*; for the *ſake* of which, *Pindar*, had he known it, would certainly have *forborn giving him ſo Vile a Character* (*a*). This indeed is Demonſtration, and not to be withſtood! I will not Attempt to anſwer it; only I will put the Dr. in mind of One falſe Colour, that he has given to his Argument: for it does not appear from any Expreſſion in this Ode, that *Pindar* is there *exhorting* Hiero *to be kind to Poets and Men of Letters* (*b*). There is not a Word of *Poets and Men of Letters* mention'd in the Verſes themſelves, whatever Gueſs the *Scholiaſt* (who perhaps knew as little of *Pindar*'s Intentions, as I or Dr. *Bentley* do) may make at their Remote Mean-

(*a*) Differ. *p.* 61.

(*b*) Ibid.

Meaning. *Pindar* only praiſes *Hiero* for his *Humanity* and *Hoſpitality*, at large; and tells him, *Croeſus* was renown'd for theſe Vertues, and *Phalaris* infamous for the want of 'em. Which I would have obſerv'd, becauſe if he be not ſpeaking here of Beneficence to *Poets and Men of Letters*, Dr. *Bentley* might as well have undertaken to prove his point from ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, as from the paſſage he has produc'd. He has lam'd it in his Quotation; I will give it the Reader entire. Ὁ μὲν θείνου βέβροτος φιλόξεινον ἀρετάν· ἡ δὲ Ταύρου χαλκέα κατέχει πανταλέος μυλιανίαν ἐχθρὰ θάλαμον κατέχοισα πασᾶ φάτις. Croeſus, ſays he, *will always be renown'd for his Humanity and Benevolence; but the Memory of the Savage and Inhuman* Phalaris *is every where deteſted.* Could a better Panegyric be made upon *Hiero*, in fewer Words? Could any thing be more artful, than the pitching upon theſe Two Oppoſite Inſtances, to ſet out his Character by? Were a Man to Complement ſome Perſon in Dr. *Bentley*'s Station, could he do it more effectually, than by ſaying of him, that he had all the Humanity and Good Nature of the Library-keeper at *Cambridge* *, and none of the Diſobliging Rude Qualities of Him at St. *James*'s?

* Mr. *Laughton.*

After all, the Dr's Opinion and Mine upon this point are not ſo very diſtant as he may imagine: for I agree with him, that there was no *Extraordinary Dearneſs* between *Steſichorus* and *Phalaris*; nor do *the Letters* themſelves imply that there was. They ſay indeed that *Phalaris* oblig'd and courted *Steſichorus*, out of Vanity, or a Real Eſteem of his Merit. And *Steſichorus* could not but pay ſome

ſome Regard to *Phalaris*, on this account; tho' he could never Love Him, or his Character: nor is there any Proof from the Epiſtles, that he did. *Phalaris*, after he had given him his Life, deſir'd only his Friendſhip in return; and *Steſichorus* was oblig'd both in Gratitude and Prudence, not to ſtand off; but to be in as Good Terms as he could with a Man that was able to do him ſo much Miſchief. We have a Lively Account of juſt ſuch a management as this between *Julius Ceſar* and *Tully*, in the Epiſtles of the Latter. When *Ceſar* had got the better of *Pompey*, whoſe Side *Tully* took, either out of a true Eſteem for *Tully*'s Vertues, or out of Deſign, he took all Methods of making him his Own; pay'd him a great many Civilities, and did him a great many Services. *Tully* could never from his Heart love a Tyrant, but we may imagine how he behav'd in this caſe; he accepted *Ceſar*'s proffer'd Friendſhip, wrote Civilly to him, and lay ſtill. No more than this, that I can ſee, ever paſs'd between *Steſichorus* and *Phalaris*, to ſpeak upon the Foot of the Letters: and if ſo, what becomes of Dr. *Bentley*'s Harangue about the Silence of Authors, in relation to this fancied Intimacy and Dearneſs? Good Writers muſt needs ſay nothing of that which never happen'd. *Steſichorus*'s Love for *Phalaris* could no more be the Subject of any of the Pens that went before us, than Dr. *Bentley*'s *Humanity* will be of any of the Pens that ſhall come after us. 'Tis Eaſie then to anſwer for the *Silence of Authors* upon This Head; whether it can be juſtified as well upon the Next, I ſhall now enquire. In

IN my Preface to *Phalaris*, among the Objections that might be rais'd againſt the Epiſtles, I mention'd This for One, that they had, for ought we knew, *lain a Thouſand Years without being taken notice of.* Dr. *Bentley* has been pleas'd to reſume this ſlight Argument of mine, as he did that of the *Dialect*, and give it a place among his Irrefragable Demonſtrations: an Honour which, I muſt own, it no ways deſerves. For, tho' he has taken this occaſion of ſhewing his Extraordinary Talent in Wit and Raillery, and tells us, the Epiſtles *were preſerv'd in the Parchments of Jove, and buried in ſome Secret Cave under Ground; or elſe they had certainly gone to Pot* *: * Differt. yet I ſuppoſe he does not in good Earneſt p. 63. think it any great Wonder, that Mortal Vellum ſhould endure a Thouſand Years; or that a ſmall Parcel of Letters ſhould lye ſo many Ages without being mention'd by any Author now extant; a Thing not altogether Incredible, becauſe it has actually happen'd to other Books beſides *Phalaris*.

Velleius Paterculus, an Elegant Writer, and one that tells us ſeveral Particulars, not to be met with in other Roman Hiſtorians, might with more reaſon expect to be taken notice of than Our Author: yet perhaps Dr. *Bentley* won't meet with any plain mention of his Writings for *Five Centuries* after he writ, till *Priſcian* quotes him, and that only in a point of Grammar. After this time he'll be as much at a loſs to find any Footſteps of him for *Nine Hundred Years* more, down to the Age of *Aventinus*: and yet the Criticks

have receiv'd him without being ſo nice as to examine, what *Secret Cave he was conceal'd in. Phædrus*, as far as I can find, was never mention'd by any Author ſince *Avienus*, till his Fables were in this Age brought to light by *Pithœus*, after they had been loſt *above a Thouſand Years*. *Lactantius de Mortibus Perſecutorum*, was a Book which the World had not ſeen ſince St. *Jerome*'s time, till, after *a Thouſand Years*, *Baluze* diſcover'd it in the famous Library of *Colebert*, and made it publick. Now, as our Diſſertator learnedly argues, if theſe Books lay *untouch'd and unſtirr'd*, they muſt have *moulder'd away*: if they were us'd during theſe Ten Centuries, *Somebody would ſurely have ſpoken of 'em.* Either the Dr. muſt give up theſe Authors as Spurious, or theſe Objections as Slight and Frivolous; and own, that the *Silence* of the Ancients is not a *Direct*, but (as any-body elſe would have thought, and call'd it) a very *Indirect* Argument againſt 'em: tho' ſtill not quite ſo indirect as another, that he founds upon a Diſagreement between *Lucian*, and the *Epiſtles*, in their Accounts of *Phalaris*. This does not come properly under the head I am now ſpeaking to: however, becauſe he has thrown together here Two or Three Paultry Proofs, that would make no Figure by themſelves, I ſhall take 'em as they lye before me. The Different Relations concerning *Phalaris* given by *Lucian*, and the *Epiſtles*, I urg'd formerly * as a Proof that *Lucian* could not write them. But as He has manag'd it, at ſecond hand, to ſhew, that *Lucian does as good as expreſly declare* he

* Preface to my Edition of *Phalaris*.

he never saw 'em, it either proves nothing, or proves too much; even that *Lucian* never saw *Timæus*, as Learned as he was, and as often as he mentions him. For *Timæus* relates, that the *Agrigentines* threw the *Brazen Bull* into the Sea; but *Lucian* says, *Phalaris* sent it to *Delphos*. What I should gather from hence would be, that *Lucian* overlook'd that and many other Authorities, and did not confine himself to strict History in a Declamation: but, according to Dr. *Bentley*'s manner of drawing Consequences, it must follow, that *Timæus* no more writ his History, than *Phalaris* did his Letters; for *Lucian* equally contradicts Both; and for that reason is a Bad Evidence against either of them. Now if *Lucian* himself be of no Authority in this point, much less are *those Authors he follow'd* *, which Dr. *Bentley* summons up as so many *Witnesses against* the Epistles. I would ask him how *many* Witnesses these are? where they liv'd? what are their Names, and the Names of the Books they wrote? 'Tis very hard to urge such Testimonies against us, as are not now, and probably never were in being: For *Lucian*, in this Harangue, seems to tye himself up to no Authors, nor to be guided by any thing but his own Invention: and this the Dr. himself confesses in another place †; where he says, Lucian *feigns an Embassy from* Phalaris *to* Delphi. And if the Ground of this whole Discourse were a *Fiction*, why does the Dr. here argue from it as seriously as if it were copy'd from the most Authentic Histories then extant? how can he allow himself to put such an Air of Gravity upon what he

* Dissert. p. 65.

† Dissert. p. 62.

knows to be ſuch a Trifle? We ſhall have him, at this rate, in his next Diſſertation, ſolemnly quoting *Lucian's Vera Hiſtoria*, too, and the unknown *Authors*, which he *follow'd*. But I ſuppoſe he reſolv'd to make the beſt advantage he could of theſe Poor Colours, for want of Better Authorities: For the Two Hiſtorians he brings to ſtrengthen his Proof, ſay nothing that is inconſiſtent with the Epiſtles. Jamblichus, he ſays, *brings in Abaris in company with* Pythagoras *to* Phalaris; *but in the Epiſtles* Abaris *refuſes to come*. Who would not have refus'd an Invitation from *Phalaris*, till he had good aſſurances that he might come with Safety? Report had told him very diſmal Stories of him, and dreſs'd him up in frightful Colours; *Abaris* perhaps did not know at firſt, but that *Phalaris* might Live upon Philoſophers Fleſh; or might have a Fancy to try, which made his Bull Roar beſt, a *Scythian*, or a *Sicilian*: an Experiment which *Abaris* by no means car'd to have made upon him; for he came from a Cold Country, and had a very particular Averſion to Fire. Theſe were very Important matters, and if he ſhould not have taken care to be fully ſatisfied in 'em before he ventur'd his Perſon, he had not been quite ſo *Wiſe* a man as he was thought to be; for one part of Wildom is to be *Cautious*. *Pythagoras* therefore manag'd at the very ſame rate; he often refus'd to come *, and yet came at laſt: why might not this be the caſe of *Abaris*? This is a very eaſie way of reconciling *Phalaris* with *Jamblichus*; and he does not differ ſo widely from *Heraclides* neither, but that They too may be brought

* Ep. LXXIV.

(with

(with Dr. *Bentley*'s Leave, and in his *Carriers* Phraſe) *to ſet Horſes together*. *Phalaris* ſays, he was an *Orphan*, before he came to *Agrigent*; and yet *Heraclides* ſays his Mother was burnt there. Dr. *Bentley* has given a Clear Solution of this Difficulty himſelf; and frankly owns, that his *Mother* might be burnt, tho' his *Father* dy'd long before. *But how*, ſays he, *came the Old Woman to be roaſted at* Agrigent, *if* Phalaris *fled alone from* Aſtypalæa, *neither Wife nor Child, nor any Relation following him, according to the Epiſtles* * ? I do not remember any ſuch Epiſtle in my Edition of *Phalaris*; but if there ſhould be ſuch an one in the King's MS, I'll anſwer this Objection to it, when the Library-keeper is in ſo good an Humor, as to favour me with a Sight of it: Till then I may be excus'd from proſecuting this Point any further. Only I muſt obſerve to the Dr, that either he uſes ſome Copy of *Heraclides* that I have not ſeen; or elſe cites him for what he does not ſay. Both Here, and in the 30th Page of his Diſſertation, he tells us, that *Heraclides* affirms *Phalaris* to have been *burnt* by the *Agrigentines*; whereas he only ſays, ὁ δῆμος ἐπυρπόλησεν. 'Tis true, it's all one to his purpoſe, whether he was burnt, or any other way put to Death: but he has ſuch a Facility of Miſunderſtanding or Miſrepreſenting Authors, to ſerve a Turn, that he does it, even when it is of no ſervice to him.

* Diſſert. p. 65.

I Hope I have now ſo thoroughly examin'd Dr. *Bentley's General Arguments*, that none of 'em can be thought to affect the whole *Body* of the Epiſtles: if his Objections againſt ſome *Particular* Letters have no more Weight in 'em, he's the beſt Patron *Phalaris* has yet met with; for the next Happineſs to being very well Defended, is that of being very weakly Oppos'd. All his Attacks of this kind are grounded upon *Chronology*: and therefore, before he could make any Approaches, he was oblig'd to ſettle the Time of *Phalaris*. And firſt he gives us the account of *Euſebius* thus. "Ol. XXXI. 2. *Phalaris apud* "*Agrigentinos Tyrannidem exercet.* Ol. XXXVII. "2. *Phalaridis Tyrannis deſtructa:* by which "reckoning he govern'd 28 Years *. Inſtead of *Ol.* XXXVII, he means, I ſuppoſe, *Ol.* XXXVIII, as 'tis in *Euſebius*; or elſe his Reckoning of 28 Years (which he could bring in here, for no other Reaſon, but to ſhew his Skill in Counting) is falſe. However, he is willing to allow, that (according to St. *Hierome*, and *Suidas*) Phalaris's *Government* comment'd Ol. LIII. 3. *and expir'd* Ol. LVII. 3. *This Account*, ſays he, *I allow of for the ſake of* Ariſtotle *and* Jamblichus, *who make him Co-temporary with* Steſichorus *and* Pythagoras †. But by his Niceneſs in Computation he confutes himſelf in the ſame Breath, and ſays, Pythagoras *was not taken notice of in* Greece *till* 80 *Years after* Ol. XXXVIII. (for I'll ſuppoſe XXXVII a falſe Print) *i. e.* Three Years after

* Diſſert. p. 14.

† Ibid. p. 15.

ter *Phalaris* dy'd. And yet *Pythagoras* had a great Name in *Greece* many Years before he came into *Sicily*. So that Dr. *Bentley* has manag'd this Point with a particular Dexterity; and prov'd that *Pythagoras* and *Phalaris* could not be acquainted, by that very account which he accepted of meerly to countenance their acquaintance. A moſt anſpicious Entrance upon his Chronological Proofs! doubtleſs all the reſt will be made out with Equal Force and Clearneſs! Here's a Page ſpent to give us his Opinion about the Age of *Phalaris*, where he has ſo contriv'd to ſay one thing, and prove another, that we are ſtill at a loſs to know what his Opinion is. Juſt ſuch another Inſtance of his Conſiſtency he gives us about *Xerxes*'s Expedition. P. 13th he ſays, *'twas Ol.* 73. P. 85th he ſays, *the very next Olympiad after* Xerxes's Expedition *Hiero* was in the Throne; and quotes *Diodorus* (xi. *p.* 39.) for it: where we read that *Hiero* came to the Crown Ol. LXXV. 3. Therefore here Dr. *Bentley* is of opinion, that *Xerxes*'s Expedition was in the 74th Olympiad. And yet if *Diodorus* is to be believ'd, (and he always believes him, when it is for his Turn to do ſo †) *Xerxes*'s Expedition was neither in the 73d, nor 74th, but 75th Olympiad. If Dr. *Bentley* be ſo Quarrelſome, that he cannot agree with himſelf, how is it poſſible for other people to agree with him? I would willingly allow of any Date of *Phalaris* that he is inclin'd to admit: but ſince he has expreſs'd himſelf ſo intricately, that 'tis hard to know which way he is determin'd, I'll take the moſt receiv'd Ac-

(*a*) Vide *Diſſ. p.* 88.

count, and go on to ſhew, that notwithſtanding any of *His* Diſcoveries, the Epiſtles might have been written before the 58th Olympiad.

He begins his Chronological Obſervations with the *Æras* of ſome Cities mention'd in the Epiſtles; a very Slippery Foundation to build an Argument upon! for all theſe Cities are ſo very ancient, that it would puzzle one of a Greater Reach in Chronology than Dr. *Bentley*, to trace their Originals. The Oldeſt Hiſtorians now extant had but very Slender Memoirs of thoſe times, and accordingly we find their Accounts ſo confus'd and contradictory, that No-body but a Man of Dr. *Bentley*'s Judgment would pretend to draw Demonſtrations from 'em. I hear the Famous Mr. *Dodwell* (who ſurpaſſes Dr. *Bentley* in Learning as much as he does in Candour and Modeſty) is now printing ſome Lectures at *Oxford*, in which he ſhews, how very obſcure and uncertain the Hiſtories of thoſe Ages are; and that from the Concurrence of thoſe Rude Accounts he meets with, he has made it probable that *Phalaris* muſt be brought much lower than even St. *Hierome* places him. This perhaps would cut off moſt of the Dr's Arguments at One Blow; but for want of this aſſiſtance, I muſt encounter 'em ſingly: and be content to wander with him thro' thoſe Woods and Mazes, in which he often loſes both Himſelf and his Reader. But before I follow him into this Dark Scene, I will conſider a little the Tendency of this way of arguing in General. He would prove that *Phalaris* could not

not poſſibly be the Author of theſe Letters, becauſe ſome Places are mention'd there under ſuch Names, as he thinks were given 'em ſince the Age of *Phalaris*. Does he know Whoſe this Sort of Proof is, and to what Ill Purpoſe it has been employ'd? It is famous for being made uſe of by *Spinoſa* to ruine the Authority of *Moſes*'s Writings; which he would prove not to be His (juſt as our Chronologer here does) from Places being mention'd in 'em, more Modern than He. Ought the Dr. in a Doubting Age to have employ'd ſuch an Argument, without the utmoſt Caution and Guard? Ought he to have propos'd it ſo Generally and Crudely, without informing his Reader, how far it held, and where it fail'd? what Exceptions were neceſſary to be made to it, and of what Solutions it was capable? Is he ſo Eager to prove *Phalaris* Spurious, that he cares not whether the Authority of the Sacred Writings ſink with him? But I hope he does n't think there's any more Weight in *Spinoſa*'s, than I think there is in His Arguments. The General Anſwer I have heard given upon this occaſion is, that theſe Names were chang'd ſince *Moſes* writ, to make his Hiſtory more intelligible to thoſe, to whom the ancient Names of thoſe Towns and Countries were no longer known. And this Plea therefore I might fairly lay hold of for *Phalaris*, if there were any need of it; and preſume, that the Copyers of theſe Letters might alter ſome of the Old Names to ſuch as were of more known and familiar Uſe in their Time. But I have no occaſion to ſay this, till

till Dr. *Bentley* has clearly prov'd some of the Names of Cities mention'd there to be later than *Phalaris*, which, I think, with all his little Skill in puzzling Accounts, he has not been able to do.

For Methods sake, he begins at the Last Epistle; from whence he cites these words; Τβλαῖοι ἢ Σικανοί, and says, *the Sophist was careful to mention such Cities* (he means, *People*) as he knew were in *Sicily* (*a*). Which is unluckily said just in this place, because the Sophist (if he be one) happens to mention a People that were not in *Sicily*; for in all the Copies of *Phalaris* 'tis Τελῶοι. Indeed I guess'd it should be Τβλῶοι, and am therefore oblig'd not to bear hard upon him for making use of my Conjecture. Granting it therefore to be Τβλῶοι, whether any of the *Sicilian Hybla's* be here meant is dubious, and therefore he says nothing to it: but when he comes to *Phintia*, which every-body owns to be in *Sicily*, he brings abundance of needless Authorities to prove 'tis there. One of these, *Diodorus*, says, that *Phintia* was built by *Phintias* of *Agrigent*, long enough after the Time of *Phalaris*; upon which Dr. *Bentley* begins to triumph a little too hastily; imagining, he has certainly prov'd this to be the *Phintia* mention'd by the Mock-*Phalaris*. Whereas he ought to have consider'd, that *Diodorus*, in the very place he cites, says, that the *Phintia* built by *Phintias* was a *Maritime* Town *: but there's another *Phintia*, which both *Ptolemy* (*b*), and *Pliny* (*c*) tell us is a *Mediterranean* Town. Now if *Phalaris*'s Friends should be as Positive as Dr. *Bentley* some-

(*a*) Differ. p. 15.

* πρὸς θαλάσσῃ ἐστὶν

(*b*) Geogr. l. 3, c. 4.

(*c*) Nat. Hist. l. 3, c. 8.

ſometimes is with leſs reaſon, that 'tis the *Mediterranean Phintia* that's mention'd in this Epiſtle, how would he diſprove 'em? This has certainly as good a Title to be there as his Maritime *Phintia* has; nay, according to his way of arguing in the next Paragraph from the Company that Towns keep, the caſe is evident in its favour; for *Hybla*, which it is here joyn'd with, is Mediterranean. Perhaps the Dr. will bravely ſtand to what he has here inconſiderately ſaid, that all theſe Authors mean the ſame place: If ſo, (which I am far from Granting) why may not *Diodorus* be miſtaken as much in the *Date* of this Town, as two Good Witneſſes prove him to be in the *Situation* of it? unleſs this *Phintias* be ſuch another Place as *Agrigent*, a Seaport Town in the *middle of Sicily* *. * Diſſert. p. 50.

From *Phintia* the Dr. marches on victoriouſly to *Alaſa*; where he finds *Steſichorus* in danger of being *ſnapt* †, in his intended Journey from thence to *Himera*. And here agen he appeals to *Diodorus*, whether there was any ſuch place as *Alaſa* in the Days of *Phalaris*. *Diodorus* gives him a leſs ſatisfactory anſwer than he did in the Caſe of *Phintia*; and tells him, that there was indeed one *Alaſa* built by *Archonides* in the 94th Olymp. (which, according to the Dr's Arithmetick, is above 120; another man would have ſaid, above 140 Years after the laſt Period of *Phalaris*) but that there were ſeveral other *Alaſa's* in *Sicily*; and therefore *Archonides* gave this City the Appellation of *Archonidium*. So that we are at liberty to chuſe any other of thoſe *Alaſa's* for *Phalaris*; unleſs Dr. *Bentley* by his † Ibid. p. 16.

Ar-

Arbitrary Power can confine us to *Archonidium*. He ſays he can, and by this Stratagem: *Alæſa* is here joyn'd with *Himera* and *Aluntium*; and the *Alæſa* of *Archonides* is upon the ſame Coaſt with theſe Two Cities: therefore *'tis evident from the Situation that this* Alæſa *of* Archonides *is meant in the Epiſtles.* A Surprizing Argument! and I verily believe his Own! If he be not too unreaſonably fond of it, I deſire to borrow it for One Moment, to prove juſt the Contrary to what He has prov'd; that *this* Alæſa *is not upon the ſame Coaſt with* Aluntium. *Tully* ſays; *Halæſini, Catanenſes, Panormitani*, &c. and agen, *Halæſini, Catanenſes, Tyndaritani*, &c.* 'Tis Evident therefore that *Alæſa* is upon the ſame Coaſt with *Catana*; that is, upon the Coaſt directly oppoſite to *Aluntium*. I could confound all the Geographers in the World with this argument; but muſt detain it no longer: I return it to the Dr. with Thanks, and with a Promiſe never to uſe it again. If any-body be of ſo *ſlow a Judgment*, as not to be *affected* with the Evidence of this proof, the Dr. who is a man that guards againſt *all poſſible Cavils and Exceptions*, has another ready to ſupport it; which plainly ſhews, that Alæſa *of* Archonides *muſt be meant in the Epiſtles, becauſe there was no other Town of this name in the days of the Sophiſt* †. The Queſtion is, whether theſe Epiſtles could be written by *Phalaris?* No, ſays Dr. *Bentley*, becauſe the *Alæſa* of *Archonides* is mention'd there. But how does it appear, that, among the ſeveral *Alæſa's* in *Sicily*, this of *Archonides* muſt needs be meant there? That, ſays he, is plain; becauſe

* Orr. in Verr.

† Diſſert. p. 17.

there

there was no other Town of that name in the days of the Sophist (*i. e.* If a Sophist writ these Letters, he must needs mean the *Alesa* of *Archonides*, because there was no other then standing. But the Dr. forgets that he is disputing with a strange sort of People, who won't allow that a Sophist writ these Letters, and if he could prove that a Sophist writ 'em, they would still deny his Consequence: for might not a Sophist mention a Town he had read of, tho' it was not standing in his time? If he might not, 'twill follow, that a Sophist could not write these Epistles, where we find the names of *Hippalca*, *Himera*, *Zancle* &c. Towns but of Date long before the Days of the Sophist. It has been the Dr's fortune in this Section to use such perverse arguments, as will sooner serve to any purpose than to what he applys 'em. Instead of proving the Epistles Spurious, he has prov'd 'em Genuine; instead of setling the true place of one City, he has unsetled all the Geography that ever was writen.

However he is not discourag'd with this ill Success at *Alesa*, but proceeds to give Battle to the *Zancleans*, upon the strength of an old saying and a true, *παλαι ἀνὴρ ὁ πλείων* (a). *Phalaris* in the 85th Epistle says, *Ἐπιμηνίδης ὁ Ζαγκλαῖος εἰς Σικελίαν ἀφίκετο*, and inscribes the 21st Epistle *Menelaus*; upon which Dr. *Bentley* makes this Remark: *Here we have mention made of* Zancleans *and* Messenians, *as if* Zancle *and* Messana *were two different Towns* (b): and again, *the* Zancleans, *by the reckoning of* Pausanias, *had been an obsolete forgotten Word* 100 *Years before the date of these pretended* Epistles

(a) Differt. p. 30.

(b) Ibid. p. 24.

(a) Differ. p. 27. *ſtles* (a). If the Author had mention'd *Zancle* and *Meſſana* too, Dr. *Bentley* might have ſaid with ſome Grounds that he miſtook 'em for *two different Towns*: but to ſay, he did ſo, from his mentioning the *Zancleans* and *Meſſenians*, is a Conſequence too nearly related to ſome we have lately parted with. For from the *Meſſenians* taking *Zancle*, and calling it after their own Name, does it follow, that there were no *Zancleans* left in the World? Were theſe poor people annihilated upon the Loſs of their City? A man leſs raſh in pronouncing their Name *forgotten and obſolete* might have Suſpected, and a man better acquainted with Hiſtory might have Known, that they continu'd many Ages in a Diſtinct Body, and under the ſame Name. *Pauſa-*

(b) Eliac. p. 346. *nias* (b), where he obſerves, that, during the *Meſſenians* abſence from *Peloponneſe*, but Two of their Nation won the Prize at the Olympicks, adds, that the *Sicilians ſay*, *theſe were not* Meſſenians, *but deſcended from the old* Zancleans *. This implys, that the *Zancleans* were not ſwallow'd up by the *Meſſenians*, but kept their Families unmix'd with their new Conquerors. And this appears more clearly from † Lib. 11. *Diodorus*, who tells us †, that in the 79th Olympiad the *Zancleans* recover'd their City out of theſe Strangers hands, that had poſſeſs'd it ſo many Years. Nay, ſo far were the *Zancleans* from being *obſolete* 100 *Years before* Phalaris, that we are ſure they preſerv'd themſelves in a Separate Body even * *L.* 3, *c.* 8. till * *Pliny*'s time, who expreſly diſtinguiſhes 'em

* Οἱ δὲ Σικελοὶ νῦν τότε ἐκ Ζαγκλαίων ἐξ ἐκείνων Μεσσηνίους φασί.

'em from the *Meſſanians*; and tells us, *Meſſana* was a Free City, but the *Zancleans* were Tributaries. Theſe Teſtimonies will ſufficiently juſtifie *Phalaris* for mentioning the *Zancleans*; and if we can bring him off as well for mentioning the *Meſſanians*, that *inexcuſable Ignorance* in this matter, which Dr. *Bentley* preſſes ſo hard upon the Sophiſt, muſt lye at his own Door, till he can remove it. But this, the Dr. ſays, Thucydides *will not ſuffer, who relates that, at the time of* Xerxes's *Expedition*, Anaxilaus *King of* Rhegium *beſieg'd* Zancle, *and took it*; *and call'd it* Meſſana. *Thucydides* * ſays indeed, that *Anaxilaus* beat out the *Samians* from *Zancle*, and call'd it *Meſſana*; but fixes the time of this action no otherwiſe than only by ſaying, 'twas *not long after the* Samians, *flying from the* Medes, *poſſeſs'd it*. Dr. *Bentley* calls this *Xerxes*'s Expedition; as if the *Medes* had never made an Incurſion upon *Greece* till the time of *Xerxes*. I don't know how he will excuſe himſelf for miſrepreſenting that Excellent Author, but only by pleading that he has dealt as freely with others. For, after the Words laſt quoted from *Thucydides*, he adds; *the ſame ſays* Herodotus; whereas what *Herodotus* † ſays, is ſo far from being *the ſame*, that it contradicts both the Story which *Thucydides* himſelf tells, and that which Dr. *Bentley* makes for him. For he ſays, not that *Anaxilaus* expell'd the *Samians* from *Zancle*, but that he aſſiſted 'em to take it; not that this was done at the time of *Xerxes*'s Expedition, but in the Reign of *Darius*. A Common Reader would

* L. 6, §. 5.

† L. 6.

would be surpriz'd to hear him profess, immediately after these Two fair Citations, that he *loves to deal ingenuously* (*a*): but I begin now to understand his Figurative Expressions; when he offers an argument, that has no Consequence, or Meaning in it, then his Phrase is, *'tis Evident*: When he has transcrib'd two or three Pages together from another man, then he cryes out, *a Discovery*: and when he would put a false Colour upon any thing, then he *loves to deal ingenuously*. But to deal a little more ingenuously than He does, I will give his Authorities all the force that they will bear, tho' not all that he lays upon 'em; and then consider, how far the Positive Testimony of *Pausanias* may prevail against 'em. That *Anaxilaus* chang'd the Name of *Zancle* into *Messana* is agreed between Dr. *Bentley* and Me; the only question is about the Date of this Change. *Thucydides* fixes upon no date: *Diodorus* places the Death of One *Anaxilaus* in the 76th Olympiad, but does n't say, this was the *Anaxilaus* that nam'd *Messana*. *Herodotus*, in the place cited, says nothing about the Change of the Names, but tells a Story of the *Samians* seizing *Zancle*, a little after *Miletus* was taken; that is, about the 70th Olympiad: and all the Ground we have, from this Passage of *Herodotus*, to conclude the Change of the Name *Zancle* into *Messana* to have happen'd after this time, is, his calling the City *Zancle*, and not *Messana*, throughout this Story: which, I think, proves nothing more, than that the Old Name was not yet so

(*a*) Differ. p. 25.

yet so utterly abolish'd, but that it was call'd indifferently either *Zancle*, or *Messana* still: and this I take to be the most Natural Interpretation of another Passage in *Herodotus* *, (which I shall produce in Terms because Dr. *Bentley* has not) where, having occasion to mention *Zancle*, after the *Samians* had possess'd it, he calls it *Zancle* still; only letting us know, that it had also a New Name, *Messana*. So that hitherto we have had no direct and positive Testimony about the Time of *Zancle*'s changing its Name. *Pausanias* is the only Author, that speaks fully up to the point: and He expresly affirms this to have happen'd in the 29th Olympiad, and tells the Story with a great deal of Solemnity and Circumstance. He says, the Flight of those *Messanians* [who nam'd *Messana*] was after the taking of *Ira* by the *Lacedæmonians*, in the 28th Olympiad, when *Chionis* the *Spartan* carried the Prize the *first* time (*a*): that, upon their Flight, *Anaxilaus* Prince of *Rhegium*, who had War with the *Zancleans*, invited 'em to joyn with him; that they did so, and together with his Forces took *Zancle*; and had it given 'em to inhabit, and new nam'd it *Messana*, in the 29th Olympiad, when the same *Chionis* won the Prize the *Second* time (*b*). That this *Anaxilaus* was the Great Grandson of *Alcidamidas*, who fled with his Family from *Messene* to *Rhegium*, after the taking of *Ithome*, and the Death of *Aristodemus* (*b*); which happen'd (he tells us in

(*a*) P. 259, 260.

(*b*) P. 260, 261.

(*c*) P. 260.

* Ὁ Κάδμος ἔπεσε — ἔμελλε ἐς Σικελίην· ἔνθα οἱ Σαμίων ἐγένετο τῶν ἐκπλησσόντων πόλιν Ζάγκλην τὴν ἐς Μεσσήνην μετονομασθεῖσαν. L. 7, § 164.

K

* P. 251. in another place *) the first Year of the 14th Olympiad, that is about *Threescore Years* before; so that all the little particulars of *Pausanias*'s whole Story are adjusted with the utmost exactness. He speaks home to the point, so, as to leave no possible room for interpreting his Words to any other Sense: and we have as much reason to depend upon him in This, as in Any Æra of Chronology whatever that he has laid down throughout his Writings. And that *Pausanias*, who gives us this account, was not unacquainted with what *Herodotus* had said, appears from his quoting *Herodotus* *, in relation to *Micythus*, the Servant of *Anaxilaus*: so that this cannot be thought an Error of his, owning to his want of Memory, or sufficient Light; but his fix'd and settled Judgment after the Matter had been by him throughly consider'd: And doubtless, when he laid down this Account so peremptorily and with so much Exactness, he had such Authorities in his View, as he judg'd sufficient to bear him out in it; and to be more than a Counterpoyse to the Testimony of *Herodotus*; which he rejects, not only as to the Age of *Anaxilaus*, but as to the Circumstances of his Life also; giving us a very different relation of them. The most Eminent Chronologers, and Men best vers'd in these things, (having never seen that *whole Tenor of History confirm'd by so many Synchronisms and Concurrences*, which, I suppose, Dr. *Bentley* keeps by him in reserve) fall in with this account of *Pausanias*.

* Τὸν δὲ Μικίθου τὸν τοῦ Ἡροδότου ἴσμεν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, ὡς Ἀναξίλαε τῷ ὑὸς ἐπίτροπον τυραννίδος, &c. Eliac. p. 340.

Ub-

Ubbo Emmius follows it, in his *Hiſtory of Ancient* Greece (*a*); *Lydiat*, in his Notes on the *Chronicon Marmoreum*; *Joſeph Scaliger*, in his *Animadverſions* upon *Euſebius* (*b*); and in his Ἀναγραφὴ Ὀλυμπάδων †: ſo does *Petavius* too (*c*), who never agrees with *Scaliger* when he can help it; and *Meurſius* (*d*), who has a diſtinct Chapter on this Subject. To ſum up our Evidence then; againſt an Indirect and Dubious Proof, built chiefly on a Diſputable Paſſage in *Herodotus*, we have the expreſs, and full, and undoubted Authority of *Pauſanias*; and the Opinions of *Ubbo Emmius*, *Lydiat*, *Scaliger*, *Petavius*, and *Meurſius*, to counterpoiſe Dr. *Bentley*'s: and if Theſe are not Enough to do it, I promiſe the Dr. to throw half a dozen more into the Scale, the next time he and I talk together.

(*a*) L. 1, p. 18.

(*b*) P. 27.

† *It was compos'd by* Scaliger *himſelf, tho' many Learned Men have quoted it ſince, as an Ancient Piece.*

(*c*) Rat. Temp. *par.* 1, *p.* 38.

(*d*) Lect. Att. *l.* 2, *c.* 23.

In the ſame Epiſtle, from whence Dr. *Bentley* took an occaſion of giving us this large and ingenuous account of *Zancle* and *Meſſana*, the *Tauromenites* were mention'd with the *Zancleans*; [Ταυρομενίτας, ἐξ Ζαγκλέως εἰς πόλιν γενομένους] upon which I expected, that when he had diſpatch'd the *Zancleans*, he would have fallen upon the *Tauromenites*: but to ſhew his Averſion to any thing that looks like Order or Method, he poſtpones 'em, to intermix ſome Proofs of a different Nature. I have already excus'd my ſelf from following him in his Rambles, and ſhall conſider *Tauromenium* here in its proper place. The only Authority he

has brought to prove *Tauromenium* ſo nam'd ſince the time of *Phalaris*, is that of *Diodorus*, which I mention'd in my Preface; and own'd to be a clear Proof againſt *Phalaris*, if it might be rely'd on. But *Diodorus* is in two Stories, which, as Dr. *Bentley* (after his way of citing Authors) has put 'em together, look plauſibly enough; but, as *Diodorus* himſelf tells 'em, are utterly inconſiſtent. In his 14th Book he ſays, that ſome *Sicilians* planted themſelves upon *Taurus*, and from their Settlement there call'd the place they built, *Tauromenium*: In the 16th Book, he ſays, that about 40 Years after this, *Andromachus* planted ſome of the Old *Naxians* upon *Taurus*, and from his long ſtay there call'd the place where he planted 'em, *Tauromenium*. Thus *Diodorus* plainly gives us Two different accounts of the Time when the Place was *nam'd*; either of which, I confeſs, would ſerve Dr. *Bentley*'s purpoſe: but ſince they contradict one-another, neither of them is to be depended on. If Dr. *Bentley* pleads, that they do not contradict one-another, becauſe the Place might be twice call'd ſo, for One and the Same Reaſon; why will not the Same Reaſon equally hold for its being call'd ſo, long before *Phalaris* liv'd? Doubtleſs the *Sicilians* had often before his time reſorted to the Strong Holds of that Mountain. Nay, *Thucydides* expreſly tells us (*a*), that there were of old People that inhabited the Hilly parts about *Naxos*: and 'tis not improbable, that Theſe might be call'd Ταυρομενῖται, before they were form'd into any Politick Body; and afterwards, when they were collected

(*a*) L. 6, § 15.

lected together, and a City was built (tho' we don't know when that was) that City might be call'd *Tauromenium*. 'Tis obſervable that *Phalaris*, tho' he has very often occaſion to mention theſe People, yet never names any ſuch Town as *Tauromenium*; never calls 'em *Citizens*, nor uſes any ſuch Expreſſion as implys, they belong'd to any *City*. This could ſcarce have happen'd, if a Sophiſt had writ theſe Letters: but 'tis no wonder that *Phalaris* ſhould write ſo, becauſe there might be *Tauromenites*, as there was a River *Tauromenius* (if *Vibius Sequeſter* be to be credited, who ſays the Town had its Name from thence) before there was a *Tauromenium*. So that Dr. *Bentley* would have no reaſon to triumph over the Defenders of *Phalaris*, if he could prove *Tauromenium* of a Later Date; much leſs, ſince he cannot prove it, ought he ſo inſultingly to call upon 'em, *Where are thoſe that cry up* Phalaris *for the florid Author of theſe Letters, who was burnt in his Own Bull above* 150 *Years before* Tauromenium *was ever thought of* (*a*)? E're I anſwer this Queſtion, I deſire to ask Him one: Where does he find that *Phalaris* was burnt in his *Bull*? Does this Great Hiſtorian take up with the Trifling Author of the Verſes upon *Ibis*, when ſo many Grave Writers have given us a different account of *Phalaris*'s Death? In another place indeed he cites *Heraclides* for this Story; but, as I have already obſerv'd, falſly. However, *Phalaris*'s *being burnt in his Bull before* Tauromenium *was thought on*, was ſo refreſhing a Quibble,

(*a*) Differ. *p.* 31.

that he would rather venture upon Falſe Hiſtory, than loſe it. The Witticiſm is ſomething remote, as it ſtands here; but when he is at leiſure to put this Diſſertation into Latin, 'twill receive a Great Advantage.

'Twas not to be hop'd, that theſe Obſcure Points concerning the *Building and Peopling Ancient Towns* ſhould be ſo far clear'd and ſettl'd, as to make 'em amount to a Plain and Direct Proof againſt the Epiſtles: However it was a piece of Learning not unworthy of a Scholar's Pains; and by a Skilful Hand might have been made uſeful to ſome Other purpoſe. I would not therefore be thought to diſparage Dr. *Bentley* for enquiring into this matter, tho' he has happen'd to leave it more obſcure than he found it; His Attempt was Commendable, whatever his Succeſs has been: but Now, methinks, he ſtoops very low; from the Riſe and *Æra's* of *Cities*, to the *Chronology* of *Old Sayings* and *Proverbs*. This would make a much more ſuitable *Appendix* to a *Vocabulary*, than to an Hiſtory of *Ancient and Modern Learning*. 'Tis ſo dry and fruitleſs, and ſo little to the purpoſe, that I am almoſt tempted to break my promiſe, and leave this part of his Diſſertation unexamin'd. While Men of Different Times have a Like Frame of Soul, and meet with Like Accidents of Life, *i. e.* while they have the ſame

ſame Faculties, and the ſame Occaſions of thinking, what Wonder is it, that they ſhould happen upon the ſame Reflection? or that Authors, who write in the ſame Language, and upon the ſame Subject, ſhould put the ſame Two Words together? Yet this is what aſtoniſhes Dr. *Bentley*; he cannot believe, that there ſhould be ſo ſtrange a *Jumping of Good Wits*, without ſome *filching* *: * Diſſert. and therefore concludes, theſe Letters muſt p. 33. be writ, not by *Phalaris* himſelf, but by a *Secretary* (*a*) of his; who is not ſo Dutiful as (*a*) Ibid. a Secretary ſhould be in attending his Maſter, p. 38. for he comes a Thouſand Years after him.

The Dr. takes this Secretary *tripping* (*b*) in (*b*) Ibid. his uſe of the Proverb ἀπὸ ξύλου; of which p. 27. the Dr. can prove *Cræſus* to be the *Author*; becauſe *when he ſent a Meſſage to the* Lampſaceni, *that if they did not ſet* Miltiades *free, he would extirpate 'em* ἀπὸ τέμνων, *the men of* Lampſacus *underſtood not the meaning of that Expreſſion: The Phraſe*, he ſays, *puzzl'd the whole City* (*c*); What if it did? muſt an Ex- (*c*) Ibid. preſſion needs be *New and Unheard of*, becauſe the Mayor and Aldermen of *Lampſacus*, and perhaps the Recorder too, did not apprehend it? But how does he prove, *it puzzl'd the WHOLE City?* plainly! becauſe One of the *Eldeſt Citizens hit upon't, and told the meaning of it.* This is very Nice Reaſoning: but he goes on to refine upon it; and ſuſpects that Herodotus *himſelf was the firſt Broacher of that Expreſſion*: for (ſays he) *thoſe firſt Hiſtorians made every-bodys Speeches for 'em.* Therefore *Herodotus* made this, which is no *Speech*, but only a *Meſſage!*

However, let *Herodotus* have worded this Meſſage; does the ſame *Herodotus* tell us, that the *Lampſacenes* were puzzl'd with an Expreſſion invented by *Herodotus*? Were the Men of *Lampſacus* in *Cræſus*'s time at a Loſs to underſtand a Phraſe, that was not thought of, till *Herodotus* an Hundred Years afterwards coin'd it? 'Tis wonderful to Me, how ſuch a Piece of Reaſoning as this could ever enter into an Head, that has Brains in it! All the Dr. has to countenance it, is the *Title* of a *Loſt Chapter* in *Gellius*: from whence he takes occaſion to gueſs at what's Loſt there, and to give us a wrong tranſlation of what's Left: *Cæſam*, which in *Herodotus*'s Greek is ἐκκοπέα, he renders *Lop'd*, inſtead of *Cut down*: Now, that a Pinetree *periſhes by Lopping*, is, I believe, [illegible], *News to the Naturaliſts*. I could not avoid taking notice of this little Miſtake, becauſe he repeats it over and over agen; and endeavours, in his awkward way, to ſqueeze Mirth out of it. *Gellius* indeed, remembring a Paſſage in *Herodotus*, where it was affirm'd, that the Pine was the only Tree, which would not ſhoot out after it was cut down, might ſay, *Quòd parùm verè dixerit Herodotus*, &c. becauſe he did not nicely examin upon what Occaſion this was brought in by *Herodotus*, or what was ſaid *in Herodotus* he might in a Quotation ſay well enough, was ſaid *by* him: but to tell us the Story of the *Lampſacenes* being at a Loſs to underſtand the Meſſage of *Cræſus*, and yet to think this Expreſſion firſt broach'd by *Herodotus*, is ſuch an Inſtance of *Oſcitation* (a), as I could not eaſily imagine, that even

(a) P. 119.

even Our Diſſertator could be guilty of. He tells us of *Dreaming Pedants, with their Elbows on their Desks*; but ſurely the Man that writ this muſt have been *faſt aſleep*, for elſe he could never have talk'd ſo wildly. If *Herodotus* is to be believ'd, *Cræſus* us'd this Expreſſion; if he is not to be believ'd, why is he brought to prove any thing? *Herodotus* is ſo far from aſſerting that *Cræſus* was the Author of this Proverbial Saying, that from this very Story we may gather, that he was not the Author of it. For when he ſent a Meſſage to the *Lampſacenes*, which he expected ſhould immediately be obey'd, would he put it into ſuch a Phraſe as they were not likely to apprehend? It ſtands to reaſon, that he thought the expreſſion Common enough; or elſe he would not have us'd it on this occaſion. All that we certainly learn from *Herodotus* is, that this Saying muſt be as Old, at leaſt, as *Cræſus*; from whence one would be apt to conclude it to be probably as Old as *Phalaris*, who is plac'd but very few Years above him.

When the Dr's head ran upon Old Sayings, how came *Nihil eſt dictum quod non dictum prius*, to eſcape him? This One, well apply'd, would have done him more ſervice than all the *Greek*, *Latin*, and *Engliſh* Proverbs with which he embelliſhes his Diſſertation; it would have ſhew'd him how vain it is to pretend to trace the Originals of Words and Phraſes; and that even the *Æra's* of Cities may be fix'd much ſooner than They. However the Dr. launches ſtill out into further Diſcoveries of this kind; he has

met

met with a *Sentence of Moral* (*a*), λόγος ἔργου ἐχόμενος, which *notable Saying*, he tells us, *had not* Phalaris *modeſtly hinted that Others had ſaid it before him, we might have taken for his Own.* He ſeems here to blame *Phalaris* for being *modeſt*, and for hinting that he borrow'd this Expreſſion from *others*, when he might as well have put it upon us for his *own*: the Dr, I believe, will never be blam'd upon either of theſe accounts. But would he really have taken this Saying for *Phalaris*'s Own, if there had been no hint of his borrowing it? and yet when *Phalaris* ſays, 'tis Older than himſelf, will he take it to be Younger? He reckons up ſeveral Authors that pretend to it, *Democritus*, *Simonides*, and the *Lacedemonians*; and decides in favour of *Democritus*, for a very good reaſon; becauſe otherwiſe it would be of no uſe to him in the preſent Debate. But I am ſo far from yielding it up to *Democritus*, that I ſay *Democritus* lays no claim to it. *Plutarch* ſays, λόγος ἔργου ἐχόμενος ἀναίσχυντος; perhaps he had met with this in ſome Paſſage in *Democritus*'s Works; but it will not follow from hence that *Democritus* was the Author of it. Many *Proverbial Gnoma*, in all Languages, are to be met with in the Dr's Diſſertation; but No-body will allow this Way of Arguing from 'em: Either theſe *Gnoma* are Dr. *Bentley*'s own, or elſe he is a *Sorry Plagiary*. *Laertius*, the other Witneſs produc'd for *Democritus*, is as far from making *Democritus* the Author of this Sentence, as *Plutarch* is. In his Life of *Democritus* we find, Τύπῳ τινὶ φησι, λόγος ἔργου ἐχόμενος. But in another place he tells us (*b*), *Solon* us'd to ſay, λόγον εἶναι ἔργον: So that *Democritus*

(*a*) Differ. P. 33.

(*b*) Life of *Solon*.

critus, according to *Laertius*'s account, and Dr. *Bentley*'s Reaſoning, muſt ſtill have *filch'd* this Saying. And from the Variety of Opinions concerning the Original of it, I have more reaſon to ſuppoſe it older than *Phalaris*, than Dr. *Bentley* has to preſume it Later. Here are Four Authors, that have an Equal Pretence to it; and if it be given to any of the Four, except *Democritus*, *Phalaris* might have us'd it after 'em: but I rather think that none of 'em have any Title to it. It is not an Obſervation of ſo deep a Reach, but that it might have been hit upon an hundred Times, by Men no wiſer than Dr. *Bentley*, or my ſelf, before the Pens of *Phalaris* or *Democritus* made it famous.

Dr. *Bentley* goes on detecting *Phalaris*'s Thefts; but for Ornaments ſake, the Phraſe is varied. He finds him, in the next Paragraph, *filching* a *Moral Sentence* *; in the Laſt, it was a *Sentence of Moral:* which is the Only Change of Style, that I have obſerv'd in Dr. *Bentley*'s Diſſertation for the better; and therefore I ought to give him the Praiſe of it. The Moral Sentence is this, Θνητὸς ὢν ἅπας ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν ἴσχων, ὡς σοφὸς πᾶς, ἢ σοφιζόμενος, which is ſtollen, he ſays, from an *Iambic* Verſe cited in *Ariſtotle*'s Rhetoric, Ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν μὴ ἐπίφερε θνητὸς ὤν. But why might not this Iambic Verſe be as well ſtolen from *Phalaris*? or why might not both the Poet and the Prince be equally beholden to a Moral Sentence more ancient than either of them? Were there no Moral Sentences before the Days of *Phalaris*? Or, ſuppoſing *Phalaris* had this Jambic Verſe in his Eye, how does it appear

* Diſſert. p. 35.

pear, that this Verſe was not Older than He? *Ariſtotle*, who cites it without a Name, leaves us in the dark, as to the Time of it. And how will the Dr's Conjecturing Faculty help him out here? will he pretend by *the Thread and Colour of it's Style* to judge to what Century it belongs? Ay, but it is *a Proverbial Gnome*, he ſays, and therefore *PROBABLY borrow'd from the Stage*; *and CONSEQUENTLY muſt be later than* Phalaris, *let it belong to what Poet You pleaſe, Tragic or Comic* (*a*). Why more *probably* borrow'd from the *Stage*, than from *Archilochus*'s Iambicks? the Fragments of which are full of thoſe Wiſe Sayings, which Dr. *Bentley* calls *Proverbial Gnoma*; and which do not, I think, look a whit the Wiſer for having that Hard Name given 'em. But ſhould I grant him his *Probably*, yet his *Conſequently* I can never allow: becauſe I am very well ſatisfied, that there were both Tragic and Comic Poets before the Days of *Phalaris*. I ſhall talk with the Dr. about the Age of *Tragedy* in another Article; here I ſhall conſider *Comedy* only. The *Chronicon Marmoreum* informs us, that it was brought into *Athens* by *Suſarion*; or rather, that a * *Stage* for the acting of Comedies was by him firſt erected in *Athens*: the Date is indeed worn out of the Marble; but it muſt be before the Tyranny of *Piſiſtratus*, with which the next Epoch begins: and the Tyranny of *Piſiſtratus* Dr. *Bentley* owns (*b*) to have been ſomething before that of *Phalaris*. Thoſe Learned Men, who have taken pains to

(*a*) Differ. P. 35.

* Ἀφ' Οὗ ΕΝ Ἀθήναις ΚΩΜΩΙΔΙΑ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ ΕΤΕΘΗ ΕΝ ΤΑΝΙΣΙ, &c. Ep. 40. *ex Cadice* v. t. in Scena Tabulæ.

(*b*) Differ. P. 41.

to illuſtrate this Chronicle, have by the Concurrence of Other Hiſtories plainly ſhewn, that the time of *Suſario* muſt fall between the 610th and 489th Year before *Chriſt*. Take fairly the Middle of this account; and it falls out before the Reign of *Phalaris*. Mr. *Selden* indeed, and ſome others, would have *Suſario* the ſame with *Sannyrio*, which would bring him down to *Ariſtophanes*'s time; but the Excellent Biſhop *Pearſon*, in his *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ* (*a*), has prov'd beyond all Controverſie, that *Suſario* is a diſtinct Poet from *Sannyrio*, and older by above 140 Years. But Comedy was yet Older than *Suſario* himſelf; for it was Older than the Word by which it was call'd in *Suſario*'s time, and had the ſame Common Name with Tragedy, long before the Diviſion of Dramatic Poetry into thoſe Two diſtinct Branches was form'd; as I ſhall prove from *Athenæus* hereafter, in my Enquiry into the Origin of Tragedy. *Suſario* was only the Improver of Comedy, as I ſhall ſhew *Theſpis* to have been of *Tragedy*: He poliſh'd it firſt perhaps, and gave it ſomething of a Regular Caſt; which was handle enough for *Diomedes Grammaticus* (*b*), the Scholiaſt on *Ariſtophanes* (*c*), and *Clemens Alexandrinus* (*d*), to attribute the Invention of it to him. But that he was not the Inventor of it, the Marble it ſelf does more than intimate, when it ſays only of him, that he firſt erected a *Stage* in *Athens*, to act Comedies upon. Indeed the Cities were beholden to the Villages for the Uſe of both Tragedy and Comedy; as we learn from *Ariſtotle* (*e*): In the Country they began, and continu'd ſome time rude

(*a*) P. 2, 10, 11.

(*b*) L. 3.
(*c*) In Prolegom.
(*d*) Strom. l. 1.
(*e*) Poet. l. 1

rude and unform'd, till the City took 'em out of the Peaſants hands, and poliſh'd 'em. Allowing then Dr. *Bentley* all his unreaſonable Demands; that *Phalaris* had a regard to the Jambic Verſe cited by *Ariſtotle*, and that That Verſe belongs to the Stage: yet we ſee, it might belong to the Stage, and be more ancient than *Phalaris*.

Our *Critic* himſelf ſeems but ill ſatisfied with this Proof, (a Thing which rarely happens to him!) and therefore caſts about for Another; and will find this Saying ſomewhere elſe. I ſee the Charge of Theft begins to clear up; we ſhall eaſily Quaſh an Indictment, that is thus laid in Two Places. Well! but who is this Second Author, that *Phalaris* has purloin'd? why, *Euripides*, in his *Philoctetes*. *And*, ſays Dr. *Bentley* *, *from* Ariſtophanes *the famous Grammarian* (*who* (*after* Ariſtotle, Callimachus, *and Others*) *writ the* Διδασκαλία, *a Work* (*were it now extant*) *moſt uſeful to Ancient Hiſtory*) *we know, that this very Fable* Philoctetes *was written* Olymp. 87; *which is* CXX *Years after the Tyrant's Deſtruction.* Was ever *Scholiaſt* urg'd to clear a more Knotty Point; or urg'd more Knottily? He might as well from the *Chronicon Marmoreum* compar'd with *Langbain's Faſti* have undertaken to prove, that *Theſpis* was before *Dryden*. *Euripides's* Words are,

* P. 36.

Πρῶτα μὲν γὰρ θυτὴν ἐς τόδ' ἦλθ' ἔχων,
Ὥστε σφαγίοις μηδὲ τὴν ὄψιν ἔχειν
Ἀθάνατον ——

Now

Now (ſays the Dr.) *to him that compares theſe with the Words of the Epiſtle, 'twill be EVIDENT, that the Author had this very Paſſage before his Pen: there is ἴχνος and μίμησις; not only a Sameneſs of Senſe, but even of Words, and thoſe not neceſſary to the Sentence: which could not fall out by Accident.* All that is *Evident*, I think, is, that there is a *Sameneſs of Reaſoning* runs throughout the Dr's whole Diſſertation: let *Phalaris* ſhift for himſelf; I am reſolv'd not to anſwer this Argument. Inſtead on't, I ſhall be bold to make an Objection to the Dr, which I deſire him to anſwer; and that is, whether it were proper and prudent in him, to accuſe *Phalaris* of a Theft by a Pair of Quotations pillag'd from my poor Notes on this Epiſtle? and whether, among his other *Proverbial Gnomæ*, he ſhould not have conſider'd That about *the Old Woman in the Oven?*

Hitherto *Phalaris* has ſtolen diſcreetly, and borrow'd Expreſſions proper for him to uſe; but now, it ſeems he ſteals without Decency or Diſtinction, out of *Callimachus*, and *Pindar*. For we find Two Words cloſe together in Him, that are found as near one another in Each of thoſe Authors. *Phalaris* has ἐπὶ ῥᾳδίοις, *Pindar* has ῥᾴδιον ἐπὶ, and *Callimachus* ἐπὶ ῥᾴδιον: the Dr. is in a *Quandary* here to determin, which of theſe *Phalaris* plunder'd; Pindar *he ſhould be inclin'd to gueſs*, but that he is more inclin'd to gueſs 'tis *Callimachus*. Indeed *Callimachus*, *Dorizing* in this point, is One Letter farther off from him, than

than *Pindar*: but then agen in Another place, which has nothing to do with This place, *Callimachus* has Two Other Words exactly the ſame. So that between *Pindar* and *Callimachus*, and *Callimachus* and *Pindar*, the Dr. is, as I obſerv'd, in a Great *Quandary*. To relieve him in this Streight, I take leave to give him my Opinion, that *Phalaris* might rob neither: for I can ſee nothing ſo Extraordinary in theſe Words, but that a much leſs Man than *Phalaris* might have hit upon 'em. The Dr. fancies, he ſees *a Quaintneſs ſomething Poetical in the Expreſſion*; a Man, that dealt leſs Tenderly with Him than I, would be apt to fancy he ſaw a Quaintneſs ſomething Pedantical in the Obſervation. Which of the Words is Poetical, ἕτερος or δαίμων? ἕτερος has no other Senſe here *, than it has wherever 'tis us'd in any Proſe Author: for the Dr. may refine upon it, as he pleaſes; it ſignifies here neither more nor leſs than *Another*; tho' being oppos'd to ἐυτυχέντων, this *Other* Fortune muſt, by conſtruction, be underſtood to mean *Ill* Fortune. Is δαίμων then Poetical? 'tis taken here for τύχη; in what Author almoſt is it not taken ſo? I could be very Learned here in my Citations; and, if I follow'd Great Examples, 'twould be a proper occaſion, for there's no Need of 'em: I will only in the Margin point out to the Dr. a Place or two from *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus* (*a*), and *Æſchines* (*b*); and put him in mind

* *Phalaris*'s Words are, ὧν ἐυτυχέντων καὶ αὐτὸς ἑτέρῳ συμπλακεῖ δαίμονι, ἐδόκεις ἂν ἧττον ἐυτυχεῖν δόξαι· Ep. 12.

(*a*) τῷ μὲν ὀδυρομένῳ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀτυχίαν, τῷ δὲ χαίροντι καὶ φέροντι τὰ παρόντα ἀγαθὰ τὸν δαίμονα ἐπαινοῦντι· P. 172. — ἐμαυτὸς κἀγὼ δαίμονα κατονομάζω· p. 180. (*b*) Τὸν δαίμονα, καὶ τὸν τύχην τὸν συμβαίνοντα ἑκάστῳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων φυλάξασθαι· In Ctesiph. p. 94. Ed. Ox.

mind of thoſe words of *Euſtathius*, Τῶν μέσων ἢ ἡ δαίμων, ἢ ἡ τύχη, ἢ ἀμφοῖν ἅπαξ ἔχων αἰ λέξεις τοῦς ἐυνοίας ἀληθῶ τι καὶ ὡ τοιαύτω, &c.

Tully, in his Third *Philippic*, has theſe Two Expreſſions, *Fatum extremum Reipublicæ*, and *Magna Vis eſt, magnum Numen unum & idem ſententiis Senatus. Fatum extremum* and *Numen* here have, in my Judgment, ſomething more of the Air of Poetry in 'em, than ὑπερ δαίμων; and accordingly we find the Firſt of 'em once, and the Laſt often us'd in that Senſe by *Virgil*. But I ſuppoſe No-body will be ſo wild as to inferr any thing from thence to the diſadvantage of that *Philippic*. The ſame is to be ſaid for the Words Ὅλεθρον ὕπνος in the 122d Epiſtle, which with great Sagacity he finds in *Callimachus*. The Latin of that Greek, *Invenere Tormentum*, is in *Horace*: will he reject at Random any Proſe-Writer, in whom I can find theſe Two Words together? if he will, I'll engage, at a venture, to find 'em. But till I know his Mind, I deſire to be excus'd from the Trouble: for, begging the Dr's pardon, I take *Index-hunting* after Words and Phraſes, to be, next *Anagrams* and *Acroſticks*, the loweſt Diverſion a Man can betake himſelf to.

As trifling as theſe Two Criticiſms are, yet Dr. *Bentley* is ſo fond of 'em, that, to make 'em immortal, he has lately reprinted 'em, with his *Fragments of Callimachus*. 'Tis the only part of his Diſſertation, which, notwithſtanding his Threatnings, he has yet thought fit to put into Latin: and, if I gueſs right, 'tis the only part that he ever will.

THE Laſt Sort of Proof the Dr. has employ'd to ſhew the Epiſtles Younger than *Phalaris*, is the uſe of ſome *Terms*, or *Words of Art*, which were invented, he ſays, after *Phalaris*'s time: he inſtances in theſe Three, *Thericlean Cups* (*a*), *Philoſophy* (*b*), and *Tragedy* (*c*).

(*a*) § III.
(*b*) § X.
(*c*) § XI.

In the 70th Epiſtle, among other things with which *Phalaris* preſents his Phyſician, mention is made of *Ten Couple of the Cups of Thericles*; whom our Critic thinks he can prove to be a *Corinthian Potter*, that liv'd an CXX Years after *Phalaris*. Before he proves it, I beg leave to interpoſe a Gueſs, about the true Reading of this Paſſage; which, if accepted, may ſave both Him and Us the trouble of his Learned Argument. The Text of *Phalaris*, as it ſtands now, is, Καὶ Πανείων ϑηρικλείων ζεύγη δέκα; what if it ſhould heretofore have been Πανείων ϑ' Ἡρακλείων &c? 'Tis a very inconſiderable Alteration, and yet it ſalves all: for that there was ſuch a Cup, nam'd from *Hercules*, and therefore Old enough for *Phalaris* to uſe, we need go no further than *Athenæus* to be inform'd; who, in his *Catalogue of Cups*, mentions the Ἡρακλεωτικὸν as a diſtinct ſort, in one place (*d*), and σκύφος Ἡρακλεωτικὸς in another *. This ſmall Alteration, which I take the Liberty to ſuggeſt, might eaſily creep into the Old MSS, which were in Capitals, without any diſtinction of Words: There the Original Reading might have been ΠΩΤΗΡΙΩΝΘΗΡΑΚΑΕΙΩΝ; and

(*d*) P. 469.
* *Vid.* Caſaub. Animad. p. 781.

and afterwards, by a ſlight Change of an A into an I, it might be corrupted into what it is Now by ſome Tranſcriber, whoſe Head was full of the *Thericlean Cup*; and who liv'd, when the *Heraclean Cup* was diſus'd and forgotten. And this is not the Only Inſtance we have of Copyers miſtaking One of theſe Names for the Other; the *Archon* in the 61ſt *Olympiad*, whoſe Name in *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus* (*a*) is *Heraclet*, in *Diodorus* (*b*) is call'd *Thericles*: and ſuch a Change, I hope, might happen in theſe Epiſtles, as has certainly happen'd in One of theſe Authors. A Candid Reader, that conſiders, what ado there is made about the Θηρίκλειος κύλιξ in Greek Writers, and how rarely the Ἡρακλεία is mention'd, will perhaps think this Conjecture not improbable, and grant me the benefit of it. But Dr. *Bentley*, I believe, will enter his Proteſt: I remember a Saying of his, with relation to a Word in *Tully*, which *Quintilian* read otherwiſe than He would have had him; *Ego verò*, ſays he, *Ciceronem ita ſcripſiſſe ne Ciceroni quidem ipſi affirmanti crediderim* †: and deſpairing therefore to get this Poor Gueſs of mine to paſs with him, I muſt e'en take *the Term* as I find it in *Phalaris*, and ſee how far it affects our preſent Argument.

(*a*) Ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν Νίκου Θ Ἡρακλείδου, Ὀλυμπ. ξα' p. 244.

(*b*) Ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησι Θηρικλείους τὸ τῶν ξα Ὀλυμπιάδα. Excerpt. è Diodoro, p. 241. it was not usual to take the very name of a Deity but with some alteration as Dionysius from Διονύσιος & Apollonius from Apollo. or Ἄπολλας. So from Heraclides Ephesius Heraclitus as if dependent on Hera.

† Epiſt. ad Millium in fine Malalæ, p. 80.

To fix the Age of *Thericles*, from whom theſe Cups are preſum'd to have their Name, the Dr. cites *Athenæus*, *One Witneſs indeed, but as GOOD as a Multitude*, he ſays, *in a matter of this nature* (*c*); he might as well, I think, have

(*c*) Differ. p. 19.

have ſaid *as Many*: for why ſhould One Witneſs be as Good as a Multitude in Caſes of this Nature? in Other Caſes, I am ſure, it is not: He may attaint *Phalaris* indeed upon a Single Evidence, but he can never in the Common Courſe of Juſtice convict him; and yet the Dr. promis'd us to give him *a Fair and Impartial Tryal* *. If now there are ſeveral material Circumſtances that diſparage this One Witneſs's Teſtimony; if he liv'd at a great diſtance from the Time he writes of; if he ſpeaks by Report and Hearſay only, without vouching any Authority; if he expreſſes himſelf ſo, that we have room to doubt, whether we know his mind; or, ſhould we know his mind, yet if he contradicts himſelf immediately afterward: I ſay, if theſe things appear againſt him, then this *One Witneſs* is ſo far from being as good as a *Multitude*, that he is as *good as None*. And I believe That will appear to be the Caſe, after I have examin'd him.

* P. 19.

Had *Athenæus* given us an Account of the Author of an Invention in his Own Time, or a little before him, we could eaſily have credited him upon his Word: but when he ſpeaks of an Invention of 600 Years ſtanding, and pretends nicely to fix the Date of it, without telling us from what Author he drew his Account, we may be allow'd to ſuſpect his Exactneſs. His Miſtakes, where he depends upon his *Memory*, or even upon his *Commonplacebook* †, without conſulting the

† Sæpe Athenæum peccare graviter dum ſuorum Excerptorum fidem ſequitur, neq; ad fontes ipſos adit, multis locis probatum nobis ſatis ſuperque. *Anim. p.* 377.

very

very Authors themſelves, are frequently taken notice of by his Learned Editor, and he could not miſtake in a point that leſs deſerv'd to be remember'd than this. Had he known himſelf from what Author he drew this account, he would without fail, have told us; for he treads not a ſingle Step without an Authority, if he can have one: and we may therefore conclude, that he had none; and that the only reaſon, which determin'd him to fix the Age of *Thericles* about *Ariſtophanes*'s time was, that he had not ſet down in his *Adverſaria*, nor did at preſent call to mind a mention of the *Thericlean* Cup in any Writer more ancient than He. For obſervable it is, that among the Several Quotations in which he abounds on this head, there is none that runs higher than the Age of that Poet. One there is, and but One, brought from a Loſt Play of his, *Philonides*; where the *Thericlean* Cup is mention'd, at large, but not a word ſaid, by which we can make any Gueſs at the Age of *Thericles*. Our Critic indeed is of opinion, that *in all probability* Athenæus *had this Indication* [about the Age of *Thericles*] *from ſome Play of* Ariſtophanes *now Loſt, where that* Corinthian *was mention'd as one then alive* (*a*) But in all probability, *Athenæus* had not this Indication from any ſuch Paſſage, becauſe Then, in all Probability, he would have been ſo Communicative as to have let his Readers have it too. Had *Ariſtophanes* nam'd *Thericles*, as *Living*, in any of his Plays, and had this been *Athenæus*'s reaſon for making 'em Cotemporary, is it credible, that among ſo many other Paſſages he produces, relating to *Thericles*, he would have omitted This, that was worth all the reſt, and ſettl'd that very point of Chronology paſt diſ-

(*a*) Differ. p. 19.

spute, which he was then laying down? especially, since he had not overloaded us on this Head, with *Aristophanes*'s Verses, having cited him but *Once*; whereas *Alexis*, a Writer of much less Character, is produc'd *four times* to it, within the compass of Twenty Citations? Could he be so Lavish, where there was no need of it? and so Sparing where the very Stress of the Point lay? I have no great Opinion either of *Athenæus*'s Judgment or Exactness, (and when I say so, I speak but the Words of *Casaubon* (a); however I cannot think him Injudicious and Careless to such a Degree as this: and therefore I conclude, that he brought no Quotation of this kind out of *Aristophanes*, because he had none to bring.

(a) Ejus Ego quidem Diligentiam in nonnullis, Judicium in multis requiro. *Animadv.* P. 375.

Indeed, as he quotes No-body for this account of the Age of *Thericles*, so he speaks of it himself with distrust. Dr. *Bentley*, 'tis true, in his Translation, has put him into the *Positive Style*; and made him roundly affirm, that the Cup *WAS* invented by *Thericles*, a *Corinthian* Potter, in *Aristophanes*'s time: but *Athenæus* expresses himself with greater Reserve. His Words are *, *One* Thericles, a Corinthian *Potter* [*who liv'd about the Time of* Aristophanes *the Comedian*] *IS SAID, or IS REPORTED to have made this Sort of Cup*; and *FAMA EST à Corinthio Figulo* Thericle *factos*, says the *Honest Latin Translator*. Which manner of speaking is the more to be observ'd, because it appears from several Passages in him, before and after this, that He himself was not satisfied of the Truth of this

* Κεραμεὺς δὲ λέγεται τὰ κύλικα ποιῆσαι Θηρικλῆς ὁ Κορίνθιος κωμῳδοποιὸς, γεγονὼς τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ τὸν Ἀριστοφάνη. P. 476.

I read with a Comma after Κορίνθιος. a Corinthian (that is how I render a Potter. The Latin it seems be doubtful a Thericle Corinthius Aristophanis. if I read rightly Eupolis in Maris (p. 153 (and I quoted before I saw this Citation from Athenæus) instead of Eupolus, of Times will make it free: for Eupolis lived in Aristophanes's time or sooner, & this Author was then young.

this *Report*: for he immediately gives us ſome other accounts of the Original of the Word *, without the leaſt Intimation which he preferrs. I allow that theſe Derivations are forc'd ones, and to be given up: for that the Name of the Cup came from the Name of a Man, is not to be doubted, I think; at leaſt it was not to be doubted, till Dr. *Bentley* attempted to prove it. Let us ſtep out of our way ſo far, as to hear his Extraordinary Argument. *Does not Common Analogy ſhew*, ſays he, *that as from* Ἡγησιλᾶς *comes* Ἡγήσιλεως, *and as from* Σοφοκλῆς *comes* Σοφόκλεως; *ſo from* Θηρικλῆς (not only *may*, but) *MUST come* Θηρίκλεως †? Wonderful! Who would have thought that ſuch Certain Concluſions could be built on the Rules of Analogy? or that there was ſo near an Affinity between Logic and Grammar? Let us try it, in another Inſtance: as from Ἀπολλᾶς comes Ἀπίωνος, ſo from Θαλῆς the Philoſopher *muſt* come θάλωνος *Virens*: Here is the ſame Analogy, and yet the Inference from it is ſtark naught. The Dr. then was too raſh in aſſerting, that Θηρίκλεως *muſt* come from Θηρικλῆς, by the Rule of Analogy: it *does* come from it, I grant; but *does* and *muſt* are very different Things. The Engliſh Rhime goes a Truer and Surer way to work;

* P. 471.

† P. 21.

As from Gooſe comes Goſlin,
So from Sir Poſ. comes Sir Poſlin.

But to return to our Serious and Weighty point; *Athenæus*, I say, proposes some other Derivations of Θηρικλεῖος beside that from Θηρικλῆς; and tho' Dr. *Bentley* and I are pretty well agreed, that they are frivolous ones, yet it does not appear any way, that *He* undervalu'd 'em; or determin'd which had the better claim to Θηρίκλειος, They, or *Thericles*: which is a Sign, I think, that He himself was not fully satisfied in the matter. And another Shrewd Sign it is, that but a few Lines before this famous Passage, he cites a Fragment from a Play of *Alexis*, where, as he interprets it (*a*), *Hercules* is brought in, drinking out of a *Thericlean* Cup: and this he does without taxing the Absurdity of the Poet; which he could hardly have omitted to do, if he had believ'd the Invention no Older than *Aristophanes*: for, at this rate, the bringing *Hercules*, and a *Thericlean Cup* upon the Stage together, would have been as ridiculous, as if one of Our Dramatic Poets should represent *William the Conquerer* drinking in *Dwight's Ware*. *Alexis*, one would think, could not have committed such an Absurdity, who liv'd but Threescore Years after *Aristophanes*; at least *Athenæus* could not have pass'd it by uncensur'd, if that *Report* about the Age of the *Thericlean* Cup had stuck with him.

(*a*) Καὶ μάντις Ἄλεξις (says he) Θηρικλείῳ ποτῷ τὸν Ἡρακλέα πίνοντα; *and does not* Alexis *introduce* Hercules *drinking out of a* Thericlean *Cup?* In the Passage from *Alexis*, as it now stands in *Athenæus*, *Thericles* is not mention'd: but 'tis plain *Athenæus* thought, from some Expressions in it, that this Cup might be intended; or else he would not have ask'd a Question about it.

and ridiculous it was.

But

Eupolis (or is it in ye MS. Fabulæ) mentioned these Cups as he is cited by Moeris Atticista (published Oxf. 1712) & by Thomas Magister (MS. comm. Bodl.) p. 21. Καθαρώτερον γὰρ τοῦ κεράσου εἰσηκόντιζεν ἡ Θηρικλῆς τ' ἐκπωματα.

I suppose this is introduced as spoken by a Slave bragging of his diligence. "For I have made his Pot cleaner than Thericles' Cups." R.

But that it did not, we have this further Reaſon to believe; that he quotes *Lynceus Samius*, in the 469th page, for a Paſſage, wherein this Cup is repreſented (not as a *Corinthian*, but) an *Athenian* Invention: for that, I think, is the Natural Conſtruction of *Lynceus*'s words; which I ſhall produce, and leave the Reader to judge of them *.

* Lynceus Samius *is brought in by* Athenæus *ſaying, that the* Rhodians *did* (Ἡλιπόδας ἀντὶ τῶν Καδίσκων ποιῆς τὰς Ἀθηναίων Θηριακλείους) work a ſort of Cup (call'd ἡλιπόδης) in imitation of the *Thericlean* Cups, made at *Athens*. *This Expreſſion of* Lynceus *was probably in his Epiſtle to* Diagoras *mention'd in another place of* Athenæus (*p.* 647.) *where* Lynceus *does* (ἐν πυρρολίπαι πίθοις τὰ χθὲς ἥκω Ἀττικῶν ἐξαιρέτους γυναικῶν τοῖς ἐν τῇ Ῥόδῳ) *compare the fineſt Athenian* Manufactures *with thoſe of Rhodes. This implys, I think, that the* Thericlean *Cup was an* Athenian *Invention; at leaſt, we have* Lynceus Samius's *word for it, no Contemptible Writer, and of pretty Early Date; as being the Scholar and Acquaintance of* Theophraſtus. *I know the Words* (τοὺς Ἀθηναίων Θηριακλείους) *are capable of another Senſe; but it is a forc'd and unnatural one.* Mr. Q.

Now if *Lynceus Samius*'s Teſtimony be receiv'd, there's an end of *Athenæus*'s *Report* about the *Corinthian Potter*. The Authors of that Report, whoever they were, might be as well out in the *Time*, as in the *Country* of *Thericles*: If he were no *Corinthian*, but an *Athenian*; he might poſſibly be no *Potter* neither, but an *Archon*, or ſome Great Man: and the *Thericlean* Cups (as the Ἀντωνίδια and Σκιπιώνεια mention'd by *Plutarch* together with them (*a*)) might be call'd ſo from him, that *us'd* 'em firſt, and not from Him that *invented* 'em. Which their Size and Worth alſo would make us apt to believe: for *Athenæus* tells us, they were Extraordinary Large, and

(*a*) In Vit. P. Æmil.

and of a Vast Price; and could therefore be the Purchase only of Great and Wealthy men, till the *Rhodians* found out a way of making 'em Slight and Cheap; and then they grew Commoner (*b*): and therefore 'tis probable, I say, that some Great Man who first us'd 'em, gave 'em their name; and not He that invented 'em. And if the most Learned Mr. *Dodwell*'s Opinion about the Age of *Phalaris* take place, (whom I hear he brings down to the LXXth Olympiad) we have the mention of an *Archon* preserv'd in *Diodorus*, who liv'd early enough to give the Name to these Cups: for he must be, by this account, above Thirty Years Older than *Phalaris* (*c*).

(*b*) Athenæ. *p.* 469.

(*c*) *He was* Archon *in* Olympiad *the* 61*st*; *as before, Page the* 147 *of these Papers.*

But let this be as it will —— From what I have produc'd out of *Athenæus*, I think, it manifestly appears, that no Weight is to be laid upon what He says in the point, who talks so loosely and waveringly about it; who produces Opinions on one side, and Opinions on t'other; who takes up a Report, an Hearsay in one page, and contradicts it by a Substantial Testimony from an Approved Author, in another; and is all over Inconsistency, and Confusion. A Witness that thus talks forwards and backwards, in a breath, ought to be set aside by consent of Both Parties; and leave the Merits of the Cause to be decided by clearer Testimonies.

And

And now what becomes of the Pompous Character, with which Dr. *Bentley* introduces this Single Evidence? *One indeed, but as good as a Multitude!* I agree with the Dr. if he means a Multitude of ſuch Suborn'd Witneſſes as he has brought to blaſt the Credit of *Phalaris*; One good Honeſt Downright Witneſs were worth 'em All: but Such, I think, I have prov'd *Athenæus* not to be in the Preſent Debate. However, if after what has been offer'd, the Reader ſhould ſtill be inclin'd to believe this One Hearſay Witneſs, I deſire him to remember, that his Evidence lies within a Narrow Compaſs, and that he affects but One Epiſtle: So that ſhould That, where the *Thericlean Cup* is mention'd prove Spurious, yet the other 147 may, to our Comfort, be Genuine ſtill. And this Conſideration I hope the Reader has carried along with him thro' all the *Particular Proofs*, that they touch only thoſe Particular Epiſtles from whence they are taken, but do not affect the whole Body of 'em; for a Paſſage, or Part of a Book may be Spurious, and yet the Book it ſelf not be Spurious: eſpecially when it is a Collection of Pieces, that have no Dependence upon one another, as *Epiſtles*, *Epigrams*, *Fables*; the Firſt Number of which may have been encreas'd by the Wantonneſs, or Vanity of Imitators in after-times, and yet the Book be Authentic in the main, and an Original ſtill.

There

There are ſome Other Important Controverſies which Dr. *Bentley* has occaſionally handled in this Paragraph; as whether *Thericles* was a *Turner*, or a *Potter**? whether *Bulls* and *Cows* may be properly call'd βόες, as well as *Lyons*, and *Tygers* †? But theſe things making neither for, nor againſt our Argument, I am not at leiſure to diſpute 'em with him. The Misfortune of it is, that this Great Variety of Reading which the Dr. produces on a very Trifling Point may perhaps miſchief him in the opinion of an Intelligent Reader; and make him thought a Man, who, with Ill Judgement, employs moſt of his Time on thoſe things that deſerve it leaſt. To take off thoſe Suſpicions, and to do his Character right, I aſſure the Reader, that he went no further for all this Learning than his Dictionaries, and what One of thoſe (*a*) referr'd him to, *Caſaubon*'s Notes on *Athenæus*. However, ſince he was ſo much oblig'd to that Great Man, I wonder that Common Gratitude, and Common Senſe ſhould not hinder him from falling upon Him, as he does, at the very time he is tranſcribing Him. *Caſaubon*, in a Paſſage of *Athenæus* relating to this Controverſie, was willing to read σκύτινα, inſtead of σίτινα; and gave his Reaſon for it, that he found it ſo in the ancient Epitomizer of *Athenæus*: to which our Diſſertator, with an Air of Superiority, replys, *One may be* CERTAIN *'twas a Fault* ONLY *in that Copy of him that* Caſaubon *us'd: for* Euſtathius, WHO APPEARS NEVER *to have ſeen the true*

* Diſſert. p. 18.
† Ibid. p. 20.
(*a*) *Heſych.* in voce Θερικλέους and the Notes upon it.

Athe-

Athenæus, *but only that* Epitome, *read it in his Book* περὶ ἡδονῆς, &c. * Which is ſaid with an Equal Degree of Truth, Decency, and Reaſon. For, in the firſt place, it is certain that *Euſtathius* had ſeen, and does ſometimes quote *Athenæus* himſelf, tho' he generally uſes the *Epitome* of him: and therefore *Caſaubon* ſays only of *Euſtathius*, that he did *SÆPE uti Epitome, integro* Athenæi *Codice neglecto*; and that he did *NON RARO ſequi lectionem quæ in Excerptis, ſpretâ eâ quæ in Contextu longè interdùm melior ac verior* †: and I'll tell the Reader One Reaſon among an hundred, why he ſhould ſooner in this caſe truſt *Caſaubon* than Dr. *Bentley*; 'tis, that *Caſaubon* had the *Excerpta* of *Athenæus* entire, and could compare 'em therefore with *Athenæus* himſelf, and with *Euſtathius*: whereas Dr. *Bentley* will not pretend, I ſuppoſe, ever to have ſeen the *Excerpta*; for they are unprinted (*a*) to this day: and when therefore he pronounces it to be apparent, that *Euſtathius* never ſaw the true *Athenæus*, he talks of a thing that he knows nothing of, and can know nothing of, but from *Caſaubon*; and yet ventures to contradict him. Had I not reaſon to make the Itch of oppoſing Great Names upon very ſlight or no Grounds, a Chief and Diſtinguiſhing Mark of Pedantry?

But what if *Euſtathius* had ſeen only the Epitome of *Athenæus*? and his Copy of the Epitome had differ'd from *Caſaubon*'s? does it

* Diſſert. p. 20, 21.

† Animad. p. 2.

(*a*) *All, but ſo much of 'em as ſupplys the Room of what we have loſt of* Athenæus *himſelf.*

it follow, that all the Reſt did ſo too? This is our Critic's admirable Inference; becauſe in *Euſtathius*'s Copy 'twas *σινδονία*, and not *σινδόνια*, therefore one may be *certain* it was ſo in *all* the Copies, but that which *Caſaubon* us'd. I can eaſily bear his Contempt of Me and my Knowledge, when I find him oppoſing one of the Greateſt Men that ever the Commonwealth of Learning produc'd, without ſo much as the Shadow of an argument to back him in it.

The Reader, I hope, will pardon me, if I wander a moment or two from my Subject, to give him a Like Inſtance of the Unreaſonable Freedom Dr. *Bentley* takes in reprehending Learned Men, even where there is no manner of Ground for it. In his Epiſtle to Dr. *Mill* *, upon mentioning an *Anapeſtic* Verſe of *Grotius*, [*Priſca domos dedit Indigena*] he takes occaſion to reprove *Him*, and with Him *Joſeph Scaliger*, and *All the Moderns*, that have written in this ſort of Verſe, for not knowing the True Meaſure of it; which, he ſays, will never admit of a *Trochee*, or a a *Tribrach* in the End of it, but when there is ſome kind of Stop and Reſt there: and for this reaſon *Seneca* the Tragœdian, he aſſures us, has not imploy'd a Trochee in that place above *once or twice* throughout all his Plays, and then only when there was a *Full Cloſe* of the Senſe: and concludes, that if *Scaliger*, *Grotius*, and the Reſt had liv'd in *Athens* or *Old Rome*, and taken this Liberty in their Plays, they would have been hiſs'd off the Stage

* *At the End of Malala.*

Stage with Infamy for it (*a*). One would think that Dr. *Bentley*, with all his Stock of Self-ſufficiency, could not have allow'd himſelf to uſe ſuch inſulting Language toward ſuch Eminent Men, but when he was perfectly ſure of his point: and yet nothing can be falſer and fuller of miſtake than what he has here aſſerted. It is Uſual among the Greek Tragœdians to end their Anapæſtick Verſes with a Trochee or a Tribrach, even where there is *No Pauſe*; of which I will give him ſeveral Inſtances out of One Play of *Æſchylus* (*b*): and *Seneca* is ſo far from having done this not above *once or twice*, and where there was a *full Cloſe* of the Senſe, that I believe he has done it at leaſt forty or fifty times, where there is either no Cloſe at all, or none beyond a Comma. I ſhall give the Dr. as many Inſtances out of *Seneca* *, as I have done

(*a*) *Tribrachys* eſt Locus *Anapæſti*: quod vitium commune eſt *Grotio* cum *Joſ. Scaligero*, *Flor. Chriſtiano*, Aliiſque opinor Omnibus qui Sæculo hoc & ſuperiore vel Tragœdias Græcas Latinè verterunt, vel ipſi ſcripſerunt novas: quibus ſolenne eſt Anapæſtos ſuos paſſim, ubi nulla Clauſula eſt, nec interpunctum, Tribrachi, vel Trochæo, vel Cretico terminare. Næ illi, ſi olim ſtante ReGræcâ vel Romanâ ſuas Fabulas edidiſſent, Sibilis & κλωσμοῖς è Scenâ explosi fuiſſent. *p.* 26. Quin & *Seneca* Tragicus, ut ſcias eum de Induſtriâ temperaviſſe, *ſemel tantum atque iterum* Trochæo Anapæſtos clauſit, *nec niſi finitâ ſententiâ*: qui ſcilicet Parœmiaco Locus eſſet, niſi is Scriptor, neſcio cur, verſum illum repudiâſſet. *Ibid.*

(*b*) . . . . . ὀπίζου
Τὴν Διὸς ἀνάλτου δυσχειρωσύνην Πρ. Δι.
Διὰ γ' ἀλίτου φιλόπλακα ζυγὸν. *v.* 122
Νεῶν δ' ἀβίωτον κύμα· ὁ πλάτας
Ἐχθρὸς ὅπως χερσαῖα πήματα. *v.* 156.
Εἰς ἀρδμὸν ἁμαὶ τῶ φιλότητα
Σπεύδων — *v.* 191.
Τὸν γ' χαλινοῖς ἐν πυρίνοις
Χαμαζόμενον — *v.* 565.
— τρόμος γ' πόντιν
Ἐλίσσειν — *v.* 1084.

* Trucibus monſtris ſtetit impoſita
Pelion Oſſa — *Agam. v.* 337.
—— Spargeret aſtra
Nubeſq; ipſas. *Med. v.* 334.
Nos Cadmæis Orgia ferre
Tecum ſolitæ. *Oet. v.* 594.
Nec Parrhaſiâ lentior arce
Sævâ ceſſit —— *Oet. v.* 1282.
—— Nunc Corybantes
Arma Ideâ quaſſata manu.
Oet. v. 1877.

done out of *Æſchylus*; and then ask him, how he durſt oppoſe men of *Grotius* and *Scaliger*'s Character, with ſuch groundleſs Aſſertions, as it was in every-body's power to diſprove, that did but caſt their Eye on *Seneca*, and the Greek Tragœdians?

But to return to our Buſineſs —— I have now examin'd, I think, all that is material in Dr. *Bentley*'s Objection about the *Thericlean Cups*, as far as the Authority of the Letters is concern'd in it: his Exception againſt My way of *Tranſlating* the Word ſhall not be forgotten in its proper place; when I come to conſider the Faults he has found with my Edition and Verſion.

This has I confeſs been a Long Article; but the next will make us amends; for I can hardly perſwade my ſelf to ſay any thing to it. He finds fault with the Letters, for making *Phalaris*, in his Addreſs to *Pythagoras*, call his Doctrine *Philoſophy*; and Him, in another place, *Philoſopher* *: why? becauſe Pythagoras *himſelf invented theſe words* *. Could *Phalaris* therefore pay him a greater Compliment, than by uſing 'em? Queen *Elizabeth* firſt coin'd the Word *Fœminilis* in a Speech of Hers, as I remember, to One of the Univerſities; could that Body have ſhow'd her an handſomer piece of reſpect, than by uſing that very Word to Her afterwards as freely, as if it had been of the beſt Age of Latin? *Pythagoras* affected to be call'd *Philoſopher*, and fram'd the Term to that very End and Purpoſe: Before his time, not only the Wiſe and Learned, but even Ordinary

* Diſſert. p. 38.

dinary Artificers, that were Skilful in their Way, were in Common Speech (*a*) ſtil'd Σοφοὶ (*b*); and *Pythagoras*, I ſuppoſe, had a mind to diſtinguiſh (*c*) himſelf from 'em. Would Dr. *Bentley* have had *Phalaris*, when he deſign'd him an Honour, rob him of the Title he was moſt fond of? He knew better how to Pleaſe the Man he was to Profit by: as little Good Nature as he had left, yet he had ſome Civility, and a great deal of Senſe; and by the help of theſe, eſcap'd that Abſurd Management, which Dr. *Bentley*, I find, had he been adviſ'd with, would have put him upon.

(*a*) *The uſe in ſome meaſure continu'd afterwards, as we learn from* Ariſtotle. Ethic. *l.* 7, *c.* 7.

(*b*) Τῶν δὲ Πυθαγόρου τότου ΣΟΦΩΝ καλουμένων συγκεχυμένη ἐπιμελη, ἔστιν ἃ Πίττου, ἃ Σκυτοτόμου, ἃ Κυβερνήτου, ἃ ἁπλῶς ὁ τέχνης τινὸς ἃ δημιουργίας ἡμιτυχοῦς, ὁ Πυθαγόρας, &c. Nic. Geraſ. *l.* 1, Arith.

(*c*) *This I take to be a truer account of his aſſuming the Name, than the Pretence that is uſually made for it, his Modeſty.*

But *how came the Fame of ſo ſmall a Buſineſs* [as *Pythagoras*'s aſſuming this Name] *to reach* Phalaris's *Ear?* He may as well ask, how he came to hear his Name was *Pythagoras?* Fame, that told him the One, muſt tell him the Other too, after once *Pythagoras* had ſet up his Pretenſions; and I deſire Dr. *Bentley* to prove that *Phalaris* ever nam'd him ſo before: and till he does That, the Epiſtles are ſafe from any Harm that this ſmall Objection can do 'em.

Before I go further, I muſt obſerve to the Reader an Inſtance of Dr. *Bentley*'s great Goodneſs, which deſerves to be taken notice of: *I could ſhew* (ſays he) *from a whole Crowd of Authors, that* Pythagoras *firſt invented the*

word: but I content my self with Two. To content himself with Two Quotations, when he could produce so Many; and that upon so Clear and Manifest a point, that he need not have produc'd Any, (in which Cases He is usually most Liberal of his Learning) is no Common Favour; and I ought therefore (as I do) thankfully to own it. It almost tempts me to drop a Question or two that I had to ask him here; as, what he means by saying, that Pythagoras *first nam'd Philosophy?* whether, that he first nam'd That Philosophy, which before was call'd Wisdom? and why, if he meant so, he did not say so (*a*)? And what again he would be at, when he tells us, that *Pythagoras invented* the word *first?* and who it was that Invented it *Last?* Something too I had to say to him about *Nurses* talking *Philosophy* (*b*): But he has been very merciful in this Paragraph; and I forgive in my Turn.

(*a*) Φιλοσοφίαν πρῶτος ὠνόμασε Πυθαγόρας, says *Laertius*, whom he translates; but it follows presently, θᾶττον δὲ ἠκμάσατο Σοφία: which makes the Expression not so improper in *Laertius*'s Greek, as Dr. *Bentley*'s English.

(*b*) Dissertat. *p.* 39.

There is still behind One Exception to the Credit of the Epistles, taken from the Names of some Tragedians, there, and no where else to be found; and from the Age and *Date of Tragedy* it self. The Section in which this Argument is manag'd is a short one, but very fruitful in Mistakes, and those of the First Rate; for which reason, and because it is the Last trouble of the kind I am likely to give the Reader, I shall insist upon it somewhat largely.

Aristolochus and *Lysinus*, he says, are *Two Tragic Poets that No-body ever heard of* *, and in another place, with great Humor, he calls 'em *Two Fairy Tragœdians* †: tho' methinks One of 'em at least seems not to be of the Race of those Little Beings; one would guess *Aristolochus*, by his Name, to be rather a *Gyant* than a *Fairy*. But to let that pass, — Is he sure, that Neither of these Poets can be trac'd in Old Writers? what does he think of the *Numerus Aristolochius* (*a*) in the Nameless Piece usually printed with *Censorinus*? does it not come from *Aristolochus*, a Poet; as the *Numerus Aristophanius* in the same Chapter does from *Aristophanes*? But because the MSS differ in this passage, I will not insist upon it. I will allow him, for the present, that No-body ever heard of either of these Tragœdians but in *Phalaris*; and I will give him a good reason for it: neither their Works, nor their Names were worth preserving. *Phalaris* has drawn their Characters in short; the One of 'em he calls *a very foolish Fellow* (*b*); and the other *a Sorry Poet, and an Impotent Adversary* (*c*): and the Writings of such Men can never last; nor even their Names, but by the Help of better Writers: and by the way therefore I would advise Dr. *Bentley* not to be too Vain upon his Performances. *Bavius* and

* P. 39.

† P. 120.

(*a*) *In the Text, as it stands printed Now, 'tis* Archebolion: *upon which* Ludovicus Carrio *has this Note,* Vulgò *Aristolochium,* Membranæ *Aristodolium: so that Some Editions (from Some MSS, I suppose) have it* Aristolochium; *or if the Editors made this change without the authority of MSS, 'twas because they knew more of this* Aristolochus *than I own I do.*

(*b*) ἀμαθέστατον Λυσίνην. Ep. 97.

(*c*) Κακὸς μὲν ποιητὴς, ἀνταγωνιστὴς δὲ ἰσχνός. Ep. 68.

and *Mævius* had a Scornful Verſe beſtow'd upon 'em by *Virgil*; and That it ſelf would have made 'em Scandalouſly well known to Poſterity, tho' No one elſe ſhould ever have nam'd 'em. If Sir *William Temple* ſhould make ſuch a Slighting Mention of Dr. *Bentley* in any of his Future Writings, *He* too will Live by that means, and not otherwiſe. Will the Dr. *expunge out of the Catalogue of Mankind*, (as his Terrible Words are †) all Poets that have the Ill Luck to be mention'd but *Once* in Old Authors? I thought, as a Critic, and a Philologer, he would have had more Regard for an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον. What, at this rate, will become of Poor *Xenocles* and *Pythangelus*? (Two Tragœdians, juſt of the ſame ſize with our Two Fairy ones) whom *Ariſtophanes* once mention'd with contempt, as *Phalaris* does Theſe, and Whom (at leaſt the Firſt of 'em) Dr. *Bentley* will be hard put to't to find mention'd by any-body beſides him. But not having conſider'd This Piece of Hiſtory ſufficiently, I will not be poſitive in it: there is Another, in which I have ſomewhat better Grounds to go upon; 'tis the Inſtance of *Chlomthachonthlus*. He was no Poet indeed, but pretty near akin to one, a Lymaker by Profeſſion, and a famous Miſrepreſenter. Perhaps the Dr. has never heard of him to this day; and perhaps he'll know as little of him two or three Years hence, as he does now: and yet I aſſure him He's to be met with in a Celebrated Greek Author, in Whom he lies buried, and unknown to many of the Great Lights of the Commonwealth of Learning, becauſe that Good Author has the

† Diſſert. *p.* 118.

Misfortune to be put out without a Good *Index*. Now I'll undertake to trace *Aristolochus*, or *Lysias*, as soon as Dr. *Bentley* shall *Chlonthachonthlus*: and when he lights upon him, he'll find, that the Author, where he is, is confessedly Genuine, notwithstanding he mentions this unheard-of Monster of a Man, whom no-body ever mention'd since or before him.

But Dr. *Bentley* has a better Objection than the Silence of Authors against these Tragœdians; he says, they could not have a being in *Phalaris*'s time, because there was then no such thing as *Tragedy* it self: *neither the Word nor Thing being known, while* Phalaris *tyrannized at* Agrigentum. *But* Thespis *was the first Inventor of it, who acted his First Tragedy twelve Years after the Death of* Phalaris: and both *the Name* and the *Thing* were then (and not till then) *born together*. In Opposition to this, I shall endeavour to make out these Three things: first, that, granting *Thespis* to have been the Inventor of Tragedy, yet he found it out early enough for *Phalaris* to have the use of the Word from him: in the next place, that Tragedy was much Older than *Thespis*; and that He was only the Improver, but not the Inventer of it: and yet further, that the *Word* Tragedy was more ancient than the *Thing*, which we now understand by it. I think these Three Points to be clear beyond dispute: if the Reader, after I have produc'd my Proofs, thinks so too, he will, I suppose, have a less Opinion of Dr. *Bentley*'s Learning and Modesty than

† Differt. p. 90.

even he has already, and be something nearer toward thinking these Epistles Genuine.

Let us suppose for the present, that *Thespis* was the Inventer, (or as Dr. *Bentley* Emphatically speaks) *the First Inventor* of Tragedy; 'tis plain, *Phalaris* might have the use of the word from him. That *Thespis* was Cotemporary with *Solon*, *Plutarch* * and *Diogenes Laertius* † expresly affirm; telling us very particularly what pass'd between *Solon* and *Thespis*, in relation to the Plays of the Latter. And this account of *Thespis*'s age Our Dissertator himself, in his first Epistle to Dr. *Mill* (a) allows. Now *Solon* was *Archon* Olympiad XLVI. 3 (b): *Phalaris* began his Reign Ol. LII. 3, and ended it Ol. LVI. 3, according to the account which Dr. *Bentley* (c) allows. So that between the Beginning of *Solon*'s and the End of *Phalaris*'s Government there are full 40 Years Time enough in Conscience, for the Word *Tragedy* to come from *Athens* to *Agrigentum*. And *Eusebius*'s *Chronicon* allows near as much Room for it, placing the Rise of Tragedy at the 47th Olympiad, a little after *Solon*'s Archonship. But to take our account at the very lowest, let us suppose that *Thespis*'s first Plays were those that *Solon* saw, towards the Latter End of his Life. *Solon* dy'd at the end of the LIII. or the beginning of the LIV Olympiad (d), that is, a Year or two after *Phalaris* took the Tyranny upon him. Take Two or Three Years be-

* Vit. *Sol.*

† in Solone.

(a) Neq; *Thespis* eâ quærentur tempestate vixit, quæ *Solonis* æqualis fuit. *P.* 46.

(b) Socrates, *quoted by* Diog. Laert. *in* Solon. Eusebius *in his Chronicon, puts it a Year later.*

(c) Dissertat. *P.* 15.

(d) Plut. Vit. Sol.

before *Solon*'s death, when *Theſpis* is ſuppos'd by this Low account firſt to have written; and from thence to the End of *Phalaris*'s Reign there is a ſpace of about 17 Years, for *Phalaris* to hear of *Theſpis*'s Tragœdies: for it does not appear, but that thoſe Letters, where the Word Τραγῳδία occurrs, might have been written at the very End of his Tyranny. However, let 'em have been written in the middle, or at the very beginning of it, yet ſtill there will be time enough for *Phalaris* to learn this new word in. That *Piſiſtratus* ſeiz'd the Government of *Athens* ſome Years before *Solon*'s death, Dr. *Bentley*, I dare ſay, will grant me: that he was turn'd out in, or rather before *Phalaris*'s Reign, he will not I hope deny me; becauſe he has own'd it in Terms, *p.* 41. of his Diſſertation. Allowing then that *Solon* and *Theſpis* were Cotemporary, there can be no doubt, whether *Phalaris* might hear of *Theſpis*'s Tragœdies.

All that can ſtartle us in the caſe is the Authority of the *Arundel Marble*, which fixes the acting of *Alceſtis*, one of *Theſpis*'s Plays, as low as the 60th Olympiad. But that all the *Æra*'s of that Marble are not rightly adjuſted, is certain, and Learned Men have prov'd beyond diſpute: and if there be miſtakes in it, why may not this be one of 'em? when what is ſaid there is contradicted by ſuch an Univerſal Concurrence of almoſt all the Hiſtory of thoſe times, which we have left? Dr. *Bentley* I am ſure ought not to inſiſt on the Authority of the Marble in this caſe, becauſe He himſelf has quitted it in an inſtance of the like Nature. The Arundelian

Marble indeed (ſays he) *differs from all theſe in the periods of* Gelo *and* Hiero; *which would quite confound all this argumentation from Notes of Time. But either that Chronologer is quite out; or we can ſafely believe nothing in Hiſtory.* Diſſert. p. 85. The Miſtake of the Marble may be in putting *Theſpis*'s name inſtead of *Phrynicus* his Scholar: and *Alceſtis* the name of the Play would make one think ſo, which *Suidas* expreſly mentions as one of *Phrynicus*'s; but is no where, that I can find, reckon'd among *Theſpis*'s. And ſuch a Miſtake might eaſily, I ſuppoſe, ariſe from the Negligence of the Graver, who, when he had gone as far as ἐφ' Ὁσίου Ἱερωνίδ, might throw his Eye upon a Lower Line, where there was an account of *Phrynichus*'s Age, and finding the Word Πατρὸς there exactly in the ſame Situation, might think himſelf right, and go on with the reſt that follow'd it: which is a Caſe that is known often to have happen'd in the copying of MSS; and may the rather be ſuppos'd to have happen'd here, becauſe the next Æra in the Marble falls as low as Olymp. 67; before which time it is not to be doubted but the *Alceſtis* of *Phrynichus* (that *Phrynichus*, who was *Theſpis*'s Scholar) was acted.

But without the help of this Conjecture, and without laying aſide the Authority of the Marble, what is ſaid there may poſſibly be true, and yet *Plutarch*'s and *Laertius*'s accounts be true too, and the Epiſtles Genuine. For ſome of *Theſpis*'s Plays might be acted in *Solon*'s time, that is, about the 53d Olympiad; and yet his *Alceſtis* be ſhown not till about the 60th; which being a Play writ-

ten after a great Experience, and when he was in his Matureſt Judgment, might be the Beſt of his Works, for ought I, or Dr. *Bentley*, can tell, and That by which he carried the Prize from his Rivals; and the fitteſt therefore to be taken notice of to Poſterity. The Dr. indeed ſays, it was his *Firſt*; and ſays it in ſuch a manner, as if the Marble had ſaid it before him: but that is only according to his Uſual Way of putting Hiſtory upon us. All the Inconvenience that ariſes from hence, is, that *Theſpis* muſt then be ſuppos'd to have written Plays at the diſtance of at leaſt Seven whole Olympiads; and what if he be? there was yet a greater diſtance between *Ariſtophanes*'s Firſt and his Laſt Play; even the Interval of Nine entire Olympiads, or 36 Year. And I believe, 'tis much about the ſame time, ſince Mr. *Dryden* wrote his Firſt Play; and the World has lately had a very convincing Inſtance, that he is not yet diſabl'd. Should Dr. *Bentley* pretend 'tis improbable, that if *Alceſtis* were *Theſpis*'s *Beſt* play, it ſhould not be mention'd by *Suidas*; my anſwer is, that I think it is as improbable, that *Suidas* ſhould not mention it, if it were his *Firſt*: and therefore I have told him my Opinion before, that it was neither his Firſt, nor Laſt; but *Phrynichus*'s Play erroneouſly apply'd to him by the Marble-Graver.

I have not mention'd *Suidas*'s Teſtimony about the Age of *Theſpis*, becauſe I think it of no manner of Conſequence; he being ſo often and ſo egregiouſly out in things of this nature, by the faultineſs of the MSS we now have

have of him or the Errors of those Authors which he at a venture transcribes. I confess, as he stands now, he seems to bring *Thespis* somewhat lower than even the Marble may be suppos'd to do; for he says, he flourish'd ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης καὶ ξ Ὀλυμπιάδος, in the 61st Olympiad: but 'tis observable, that the Decads in this Number are not express'd by a Word, but a Numeral Letter, which is more liable to alteration; and a ν therefore might easily creep into the place of a Ν: the restoring of which would make his account consistent with better Authorities (a). However that may be, Dr. *Bentley* must remember, that He himself has produc'd (b) this account in his Letter after *Malala*, as Consistent with *Plutarch*'s Story, which makes *Thespis* contemporary with *Solon*; and is oblig'd therefore to reconcile the One with the Other, as much as I am: and he must remember too, that *Suidas* in the same place tells us, that *Thespis* was the Sixteenth Tragœdian from *Epigenes Sicyonius*; and if he admits This part of his account, he'll lose as much by it, as he gains by the Other.

(a) Itaq; ut rectè monuit *Meursius* in *Solone*, graviter errat *Suidas*, qui in *Olymp.* 61 cum fabulas primùm docuisse scribit. *Menag. Comm. in Solon.*

(b) P. 46.

For whether *Thespis* was as ancient as *Solon* it matters not much, if *Tragedy* was yet more ancient than He: and that it was so, there are such Plain and Pregnant Testimonies as are not to be withstood. *Plato*'s words on this occasion are very remarkable and full: *Tragedy*, says he, *is of ancient Usage in this Country, nor did it take its Rise from* Thespis *and*

and Phrynichus, *as Some Imagine* (it ſeems, for Dr. *Bentley*'s comfort, there were Men Ignorant enough, even in *Plato*'s Time, to think ſo) *but if You conſider the thing well, You will find, that it is extremely ancient* (*u*): and the Reaſon of his introducing this Reflection ſhews, that he thought it almoſt as ancient as *Minos*. I was aware of this Objection from the Date of Tragœdy, when I put out *Phalaris*; and thought therefore that I had prevented it by a ſhort Note on the 97th Epiſtle, where I referr'd the Reader to this Paſſage in *Plato*. Dr. *Bentley*, who has made ſo free an uſe of many Hints in my Book, *againſt Phalaris*, ſhould not in Juſtice have overlook'd this Note, which made ſo ſtrongly for him: but I find he has the Secret of ſeeing nothing in an Author, but what ſerves to countenance his Own Opinions.

(*u*) Ἡ δὲ Τραγῳδία ἦν παλαιὰ ἐσθʼ ὅτε, καὶ, ὡς ἔστι, αὖτη Θέσπιδος καὶ ἀρχαίων, οὐ νῦν θρυλίχου· ἀλλὰ, οἶμαι, εἰ βίλεσθε ἐπισκέψασθαι, πάνυ παλαιὸν αὐτὸ εὑρήσετε, &c. Plato in Minoc.

Plato's Teſtimony needs no Support with any man that juſtly eſteems him; which for fear Dr. *Bentley* ſhould not, I will produce another Witneſs, whoſe Character and Works, I believe, are better known to him. It is *Diogenes Laertius*, who in the Life of *Plato* has theſe Words, *ANTIENTLY* (ſays he) *the Chorus did alone ſuſtain the Tragœdy*; *AFTERWARDS* Theſpis *found out One Actor*, (*b*) *and gave the Chorus time to breathe* (*b*): to whom

(*b*) Τὸ πρῶτον μὲν μόνος ὁ χορὸς διεδραμάτιζεν, ὕστερον δὲ Θέσπις ἕνα ὑπεκρίνατο ἐξεῦρεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀναπνεῦσαι τὸν χορὸν &c. Τὸ παλαιὸν ἐν τῇ Τραγῳδίᾳ.

Æſchy-

Æschylus, he tells us, added a Second; and *Sophocles*, a Third. So that Tragœdy, according to His Opinion too, was more ancient than *Thespis*; and He only an Improver of it.

Laertius's account falls in exactly with what *Aristotle* has said on the same Subject, as far as *Aristotle* goes; only it is more particular and full. *Aristotle* *, reckoning up the Gradual Advances that had been made towards the perfection of Tragœdy, after its First Establishment, tells us, just as *Laertius* does, that *Æschylus* improv'd it mightily, by bringing a Second Actor on the Stage; and that *Sophocles* perfected it by the addition of a Third. *Thespis*'s Invention of a First Actor is here imply'd also, tho' it be not express'd: and indeed it was not to *Aristotle*'s purpose to mention it, when he was considering the Improvements of Tragœdy, as an Artificial Poem, which had a *Fable*, and an Action distinct from that of the Chorus; that is indeed, as it came out of the Hands of *Thespis*, who in this respect must be own'd to have been the Founder rather than the Improver of it. The not considering these Two different States and Conditions of Tragœdy is what has bred great Confusion in the Writings of the Critics, and led Dr. *Bentley* into all his Numerous Errors in this point. If he will suffer himself to be taught by so Inconsiderable a Writer as I am, I will endeavour to set him right, and to give him a Clearer Account of it.

* In his Poetry.

Tragœdy at firſt was nothing but an Hymn to the honour of *Bacchus*, ſung by a Number of Peaſants, after their Vintage was over, whilſt the Goat lay bleeding upon the Altar. The Company that perform'd this Sacred Song, either alternately, or all together, as it happen'd, were what in Succeeding Times was call'd the *Chorus*; in which therefore it muſt be remember'd that the Foundation of Tragœdy was laid. Afterwards the Subject of Tragœdy was much alter'd and vary'd: for the Compoſers of thoſe Songs together with the Praiſes of *Bacchus* joyn'd the Encomiums of Great and Famous Perſons; and Satyrical Reproofs † alſo of the Vicious Men, and Manners of their Times. But ſtill All this was perform'd by the *Chorus*; and (as *Laertius* obſerves) continu'd ſo to be till *Theſpis*'s time. He, to pleaſe the Audience, and relieve the Chorus, brought a Single Actor upon the Stage; who, at fit Intervals, came out from the Reſt, and imitated the Actions of ſome Illuſtrious Perſon, and retir'd agen, when the Chorus had taken breath; which was ſtill the moſt Conſiderable Part of the Entertainment. However by this Invention a new Turn was given to Tragœdy, the Buſineſs of the Chorus was leſſen'd, and part of it brought into the hands of a ſingle Actor, and ſomething like a *Plot*, or *Fable* was introduc'd. *Æſchylus* improv'd upon this Model, and grew ſtill more upon the Chorus, by adding a Second * Actor, and diverſifying the Fable; and *Sophocles* at laſt compleated the Poem, by the addition of a Third.

† Ibid.

* Æſchylus *employ'd ſometimes a Third Actor too, but rarely.*

Third. And by this time the Chorus, which was at firſt Eſſential to Tragœdy, and did all in it, was grown only an Acceſſory Ornament of it; and employ'd to relieve the Actors in the ſame manner that the Actors were at firſt found out to relieve That. Nay, to ſee the fate of things, the Chorus, which was anciently the Play it ſelf, now ſerv'd only to repreſent the Spectators, and to ſuggeſt ſuch Reflections as They, obſerving what paſs'd upon the Stage, were ſuppos'd to make.

Tragœdy being now a thing ſo very different from what it was before, and *Theſpis* having made the firſt Step towards this great Change, it is no Wonder that He ſhould be call'd ſometimes the Author of it; that is, the Author of that Sort of Tragœdy, which conſiſted in Imitation, and a Fable, excluſive to the Neceſſity of a Chorus; and which had now, among the Men of Art, who ſpake nicely, and reaſon'd ſubtilly about things, almoſt engroſs'd the Name. I ſay, excluſive of the Neceſſity of a Chorus: for tho', in remembrance of the firſt Riſe of Tragœdy, and in complyance with the Ceremonies of Religion, the Chorus was ſtill retain'd; yet it came in only by the bye as it were, and the Action, upon which the Play turn'd, was Entire and Perfect without it.

What was ſaid of Tragœdy then in the Second and more Confin'd Senſe of the word, Dr. *Bentley* in his great Wiſdom and Learning took as ſaid of it at large, and pronounc'd at a venture, that there was no ſuch Thing as Tragœdy before *Theſpis*'s time, becauſe there

was

was no ſuch thing as that Sort of Tragœdy which *Theſpis* invented: which is as if I ſhould ſay, the *Italians* firſt found out *Opera's*, a Baſtard Sort of Tragœdy, in theſe Latter Days; and therefore the *Italians* firſt found out Tragœdy. There is no difference in the caſe but this, that what the *Italians* did was a Debaſement of Tragœdy, whereas *Theſpis*'s Invention was an Improvement of it; but ſtill Tragœdy it ſelf was equally before the Improvement of the One and the Debaſement of the other.

Our Critic was not contented to make but One Miſtake on this Point; He has doubled it, by urging alſo a miſtaken Authority for it: for thoſe Verſes of *Horace*, which He, out of the Depth of his Reading, produces on this occaſion, are far from countenancing his Raſh Aſſertions. At firſt ſight indeed he might think they did; but a Second Thought (and ſuch Thoughts, one of his Greek Proverbs ſays, are the Beſt) would have inform'd him, that *Horace* had expreſs'd himſelf with the utmoſt Caution in this matter; and diſtinguiſh'd Critically between that Sort of Tragœdy, which was before *Theſpis*'s time, and That which *Theſpis* himſelf introduc'd.

Ignotum Tragica Genus invenisse Camœna
Dicitur, & Plaustris vexisse Poemata Theſpis.

It was *Ignotum Genus Tragica Camœna*, an Unknown Kind of Tragic Poetry, which *Theſpis* found out; and that implys, I think, that there was Another Kind of Tragic Poetry in uſe before him. And that this is no New

In-

Interpretation of the Words, made to serve a Turn, the Dr. may be satisfied, if he pleases to consult the Commentators on the place: they are not in Greek indeed, but they speak as Good Sense, as if they were; and some of the Best of 'em give this very account of it.

Upon this Bottom we can answer for all the unwary Expressions, that may have dropt at any time from the Pens of Old Writers, in relation to *Thespis*; particularly for that Passage in *Plutarch* *, where he represents *Thespis*, and those of his time as ἀρχόμενοι κατὰ τὴν τραγῳδίαν. What he means by that Ambiguous Phrase, may be disputed; whether it be not, that They first gave *Life* and Motion to Tragœdy, as they certainly did, by taking it in some measure out of the Hands of the Chorus, and making it an *Imitative*, or *Dramatic* Poem: but whatever he means, I think I have prov'd, that he could not mean, consistently with History, that there was no such thing as Tragœdy of any kind before the days of *Thespis*. I add, that neither could he mean this, and be consistent with Himself: for he expresly tells us in another place †, that the Acting of Tragœdies was One part of the Funeral Solemnities which the *Athenians* perform'd at the Tomb of *Theseus*.

* *In the Life of Solon.*

† *In the Life of Theseus.*

The Reader may remember a Reflection quoted from *Vellejus Paterculus* towards the beginning of this Discourse, where *Homer* is represented as the Author of Epic Poetry, and *Archilochus* of Iambicks, or the Epode: not that they were either of them so, strictly speaking; for *Aristotle* tells us, that there were

were many Epic Poems before *Homer*, tho' they happen'd to be loſt; and that *Homer*'s *Margites* was written (interchangably in Heroic and Iambic Verſe) long before *Archilochus*. *Paterculus*'s meaning was, or ſhould have been, that they each of 'em brought the ſeveral Sorts of Poetry they practis'd, and which before them were rough and unfiniſh'd, to ſuch a degree of perfection, as that they juſtly deſerv'd to be call'd the Fathers of 'em. And in This Senſe it is that we muſt underſtand thoſe Authors, who make *Theſpis* the Inventor of Tragœdy; or allow, that they ſpake inconſiderately, and againſt the Clear Truth of Hiſtory. I queſtion not, but ſome Hundreds of Years hence, *Butler* will be thought the Author of *Engliſh Burleſque*, tho' there were many Little things written in that way, before His *Hudibras*: but He having ſo far outſtripp'd thoſe that wrote before him, and carried that Sort of Verſe up to ſuch a Pitch of Excellence, will probably be eſteem'd and call'd the Inventer of it; and his Predeceſſors not be thought worth mentioning or remembring.

By this time I hope the Reader is ſatisfied, that Two of the Three points which Dr. *Bentley* has advanc'd on this head, are altogether miſtaken; that, allowing *Theſpis* to have been the Author of Tragœdy, yet he might have invented it time enough for *Phalaris* to hear of it; and that *Theſpis* was not the firſt, but (to comply with the Dr's manner of ſpeaking) the *Second* Inventer of it. His Third Aſſertion is yet more extravagant, and further from all Colour of Truth, than either of

the former: it will be eaſie to confute it, if we can but underſtand it.

* P. 40. *Neither was the Name of Tragœdy* (ſays he *) *more ancient than the Thing* — What does he mean? *Names* I thought were invented to ſignifie *Things*; and that the Things themſelves therefore muſt be before the Names by which they are call'd: but he opens himſelf, — *as ſometimes it happens when an Old Word is borrow'd and apply'd to a New Notion.* Right! it ſometimes happens that a *Word* is Older than the *Thing* to which it is apply'd; but *Names* can never be before the Things they belong to. But to forgive him This want of Exactneſs, among a Thouſand, I agree perfectly with him, that the *Word* Tragœdy was not more ancient than the *Thing*; they were, as he ſays, *born together*, or at leaſt pretty near one-another: but for that very reaſon I inferr, that the *Word* Tragœdy was long before *Theſpis*, becauſe I have prov'd that the *Thing* it ſelf was: and he could not therefore favour my pretenſions more, than by allowing that they were *born together*. However, this Twin-Birth muſt be underſtood of Tragœdy in its firſt Infant State, as it took its riſe from the *Dithyrambicks* of *Bacchus*; for the Name of Tragœdy was undoubtedly more ancient than the Thing, that is *now*, or has generally been for Two thouſand Years underſtood by it. It cannot reaſonably be queſtion'd, but that thoſe *Bacchic Hymns* they ſung in Chorus round their Altars (from whence the Regular Tragœdy came) were call'd by this Name; the Etymology of the word ſhews that it belong'd to 'em; for whether it be deriv'd

riv'd from τρύγ [*vindemia*] or from τρύξ [*hircus*], joyn'd with ἀδὴ in which the Grammarians are divided *) either way it very naturally expreſſes ſome of the Great Circumſtances of that Solemnity: according to its Firſt Derivation, it points out the *Time* of it, which was upon the Gathering in of their *Vintage* †; according to its Second, the *Sacrifice* it ſelf, at the Offering of which theſe Odes were ſung. τῆς τρύγης καιρὸν, ἀφ' ἧς ἡ τρυγῳδία τὸ σῶμα ἐλάβη ἢ κωμῳδία Exc. Athen. p. 40.

* *There is a Third Etymology of the word from* τρυξ, *the Lees of wine, and* ἀδὴ: *but the Reaſon of it falls in with that of the firſt.*

† ἐυρίθη κατ' αὐτὴν τῆς τρύγης

But as to This we are in the dark, and have only Probabilities to guide us; it may with more aſſurance be ſaid, that under the word Tragœdy both Tragœdy and Comœdy were at firſt comprehended: which double Uſe of the Word continu'd alſo, after theſe Two Sorts of Dramatic Poetry were ſufficiently diſtinguiſh'd; as we may learn from *Athenæus* (*a*), from *Ariſtophanes*, and his *Scholiaſt* (*b*), and from *Heſychius* (*c*). If This be ſo, (*a*) ἀφ' ἧς ἡ τρυγῳδία &c. as above.

(*b*) In his Notes on this Verſe in ΑΧΑΡΝΗΣ, *Act.* 1, *Sc.* 5. Μέλλω δεῖ τὰς πόλεις τρυγῳδίαν ποιῶν] Κωμῳδίαν· ὅτου διὰ τράγα ἐπῆλθον καμβάσκειν, τῶν δὲ νῦν ἴσον· ἢ διὰ τὸ, μὰ ὄντας σκηπτούχους τὰς ἀρχὰς, πυγὴ χειδὼν πὼς ἐλέγετο· And again in his Notes on this Verſe in ΔΟΛΟΣΚΕΣ, — ἀνατὶς γνάμης, ἢ μείζον· ἢ ὅτι τρυγῳδὸς] αὐτὸ φ, μείζον· ἢ χ' τὰς Κωμῳδίας &c. *p.* 476. And in the 11th book of *Athenæus*, c. 13, there is a Fragment of *Ariſtophanes*'s ΓΗΡΥΤΤΑΔΗΣ preſerv'd, where Τραγῳδὸς ſignifies a *Comedian*, — φησὶν μὲν Σανυρίων — Ἀπὸ τῆς Τραγῳδῶν· The ſame word Τρυγῳδία ſignifies Tragœdy, properly ſo call'd, in this Paſſage of *Ariſtophanes*, αὐτὸς δ' ἐνδὺς ἀναβαίνου πάλ — Τρυγῳδίαν· (ΑΧΑΡΝ. *Act.* 2, *Sc.* 3.) for This is ſpoken of *Euripides*. Beſide Theſe, there are Two other Paſſages in the *Prolegomena* to *Ariſtophanes*: — τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ [διὰ κωμῳδίαν] ἢ τρυγῳδίαν φασὶ, διὰ τὸ, &c. Prol. ad Ariſt. ἐπὶ Κωμῳδ· — ἔστι δὲ παλαίων οἱ τραγῳδίαν, εἶτα τρυγῳδίαν μεθ' ὕδ', ἵν τρυγὸς χρώμενοι κωμῳδῶσι· Ibid. (*c*) *Heſych.* in Voce τρυγῳδὸν·

and Comedy was more ancient than *Thespis*, as I have prov'd before (*a*) in these Papers, it is clear that the Word Tragœdy was before *Thespis* too. I will detain the Reader no longer upon so plain and known a point, and which I did not think any man, that had the least Skill in these matters, would have put me to the trouble of proving.

(*a*) P. 140, 141.

I have mention'd once or twice the Early Mixture of Satyr and Ridicule that crept into this Serious Poem; it certainly did so, and continu'd very long in it, even after Comœdy set up for a distinct sort; and it is to be thought, even to the days of *Thespis* himself, if not afterwards. His movable Stage, a Cart, was not probably free from that Scurrility and Buffoonery which were so usually utter'd from that place, that ἐξαμάξειν, and (*b*) ἐξ ἁμάξης λέγειν, became Proverbial Expressions for Satyr and Jeering. I desire this may be observ'd, because it gives us an easie and natural account of that expression in *Phalaris* [περὶ ἐμῆ τραγῳδίᾳ λέγουσι] which Dr. *Bentley* has made such hideous work with: for the meaning of that is no more than this, that they wrote *Lampoons*, or Satyrical Verses upon him; with which the Tragœdies before and about his time (I have said) were usually twisted. So that tho' *Phalaris could not be the argument of Tragœdy while he liv'd*, (as our Critic learnedly objects) yet he might be the argument of that Sort of Satyr which usually accompanied Tragœdy: and the Dr. may perhaps, before he dies, have a convincing Proof, that a Man may

(*b*) Βοᾶς μὲν ἐξ ἁμάξης μάζων ἄκατος ἐξ ἁμάξης. Demosth. contra Æsch. § 37.

may be the Subject of ſuch Tragœdies, while he is Living.

And now, upon the whole, is not Dr. *Bentley* a moſt Diſcreet Writer? who has choſen out ſuch an argument to prove *Phalaris* Spurious, as his beſt Friends would have pitch'd upon to prove him Genuine? for τραγῳδία in the days of *Phalaris* took into its ſignification ſomewhat of a *Lampoon*, or Abuſive Copy of Verſes, according to the Uſe of it in the Epiſtles: but it had nothing of that Senſe in the Sophiſt's time, let the Dr. place him as high as he can.

I have nothing more to ſay to the Dr. upon any of his Arguments againſt the Authority of *Phalaris*; I have conſider'd 'em All, with great Fairneſs, I am ſure, and, I fear, with more Exactneſs than they will be thought to deſerve. I will not follow his Pattern ſo far, as to ſhut up theſe Reflections by ſaying, that *I have had too much Regard to him in giving him the Honour and Patience of ſo long an Examination* *; the Regard I had was to my Self, and to thoſe Excellent Perſons, who were injur'd on my account; and, to do right to Them, averſe as I am to Employments of this nature, I could think no Trouble too great, no Task too mean.

* Diſſert. p. 65.

If I am capable of judging either of Dr. *Bentley*'s Performances, or my Own, the Caſe ſtands thus between us: Of the *Five General Arguments* he has produc'd, the *Four firſt* are Evidently againſt him; neither *the Dialect*, nor *the Age of the Greek*, nor *the way of Counting by Talents*, nor *the Matter and Buſineſs of the Letters*, can in the leaſt ſhock a Conſidering

Reader; the Only Point that can poſſibly prejudice him, is that of their *Lying hid for a Thouſand Years*: and how far I have taken off the Force of this Objection the World muſt judge.

Among his *Particular Proofs*, That which relates to *the Towns* is ſo involv'd in Obſcurity, that I muſt own 'tis perfectly clear'd on neither Side: that *Three* of 'em, notwithſtanding what He has ſaid, may be as Old as *Phalaris*, I think I have made out; and for the *Fourth*, *Tauromenium*, I have ſhewn that the Single Author he depends upon gives Inconſiſtent Accounts of it: and ſhould either of thoſe accounts be admitted, I have further ſhewn, that the Epiſtles no where neceſſarily imply, that there was ſuch a Town when They were written.

The *Proverbs and Expreſſions* found in Later Authors, are ſuch Slight and Inſignificant Objections, that 'tis no piece of Vanity to ſay, I have effectually remov'd 'em.

And as to his *Words of Art*, the Firſt of 'em, about the *Thericlean Cups*, has indeed a Shew of Proof, but no Proof at the bottom; the Next, taken from the Term *Philoſophy*, has not ſo much as the Shew of a Proof: and the Laſt, from *Tragedy*, is indeed a Proof, and a Good One; but it makes directly againſt him.

There are then in his Whole Diſſertation but *Three Points*, that can be thought to affect the Epiſtles even by a Careleſs Reader; That of their *Lying hid for a Thouſand Years*, that of *Tauromenium*, and that of *Thericles*: Of theſe the

the *Two First* he borrow'd from Me (*a*), without acknowledging the Debt, or making the leaſt Improvement of Either; the *Laſt* he was probably ſo happy as to light upon in turning a Dictionary: all that Glitter of Quotations, with which he ſhines upon this Article, was drawn from Honeſt *Heſychius*, one of the great Storehouſes of his *Alphabetical* Learning.

(*a*)—Sunt cur dubitem an *Phalaris* jure vendicet ſuas. Neq; enim facile poterant Literæ & à Viro tam inſigni ſcriptæ, & in ſuo genere abſolutæ, *ultra mille annos ignotæ penitus* latere —

Quòd ſi vera refert *Diodorus Siculus*, *Tauromenium*, ad cujus cives hic Auctor ſcribit, & conditam fuiſſe, & eo nomine donatam poſt Naxum à Dionyſio Juniore dirutam, actum eſt de *Phalaridis* Titulo, & ruit omnis male ſuſtentata Conjecturis Authoritas. *Præf. Phalar.*

The only thing in his Piece, that is clearly made out, and may ſeem material, is his Proof of *Octilius Lucanus*'s being Genuine: but 'tis ſuch an one, as proves at the ſame time, that *Phalaris* too may be Genuine, and deſtroys the force of all he has ſaid upon the Article of *the Dialect*; and is ſo far from being *New* and his *Own* (as he has the Modeſty to pretend) that 'tis taken Word for Word out of an Author (*b*) that writ above fifty Years ago; the Scarcity of whoſe Book, and the Probability of not being trac'd, encourag'd him to ſet up for a Diſcoverer.

(*b*) *Vizzanius.*

This is a Short and True Account of Dr. *Bentley*'s Whole Performance: if he be of Opinion, that I have undervalu'd any of his *Arguments*, I am willing, Weary as I am, to try 'em upon *Another Subject*; to propoſe 'em in their Natural Light and Force, and ſee whether he will admit the Concluſion.

IF Dr. *Bentley's* Diſſertations ſhould outlive ſome Centuries, which I am far from thinking they will; and ſhould be read, which I am ſtill farther from ſuſpecting; and ſhould the Criticks of ſucceeding Ages ſtart an impertinent Diſpute, whether they be Genuine or not; I am of opinion as Strong and Concluding Arguments may be brought to prove 'em Spurious, and falſly aſcrib'd to Dr. *Bentley*, as any the Dr. has us'd to ſhew the Letters now in Debate to be a Thouſand Years later than *Phalaris*. They may carry the Dr's Name in the front of 'em, as the Letters do that of the Tyrant; but Thoſe who examine 'em cloſely, and try 'em by the Rules of Criticiſm, which the Dr. has here eſtabliſh'd, will eaſily Diſcover the Impoſture. For we will ſuppoſe, that after thoſe Papers have lain hid and neglected for ſome Ages, they may unluckily fall into the hands of a Critic, who has Leiſure and Ill Nature enough to trouble Himſelf and the World with a Nice Enquiry, whether they are Genuine, or not: I think he would, or might, in Dr. *Bentley's* Way and Manner, and for the moſt part in his very Words too, argue againſt their being truly His to whom they are aſcrib'd. * "The "Sophiſt, whoever he was, that wrote theſe "Looſe Diſſertations in the Name and Cha"racter of Dr. *Bentley*, (give me leave to "ſay this now which I ſhall prove by and "by) had not ſo bad an Hand at humouring "and perſonating, but that Some may be"lieve

* *The lines that have Comma's on the ſide are in Dr. Bentley's own Language.*

" lieve it is the Librarian himſelf who talks
" ſo big; and may not diſcover the Aſs un-
" der the Skin of that Lyon (*a*) in Criticiſm (*a*) Differ.
and Philology. " But I ſhall examine Dr. *P.* 11.
" *Bentley*'s Title to theſe Diſſertations, and
" ſhall not go to diſpoſſeſs him by an Arbi-
" trary Sentence in his own Dogmatical Way,
" but proceed with him upon a Lawful Evi-
" dence, and a fair Impartial Tryal. And I
" am very much miſtaken in the Nature and
" Force of my Proofs, if ever any man here-
" after that reads them perſiſt in his Opi-
" nion of making Dr. *Bentley* the Author of
" theſe Criticiſms (*b*). (*b*) Ibid.
" Had all other ways fail'd us of detecting *P.* 13.
" this Impoſtor, yet his very *Speech* had be-
" tray'd him, for it is neither that of a Scho-
" lar, nor an Engliſhman; neither Greek,
" Latin, nor Engliſh, but a Medley of all
" Three: He had forgot that the Scene of
" theſe Writings was *London*, where the En-
" gliſh Tongue was generally ſpoken and
" written; as, beſides other Teſtimonies,
" the very thing ſpeaks it ſelf in the Re-
" mains of *London* Authors, as the *Gazetts*,
" the *Caſes* written by *London Divines*, and
" others. How comes it to paſs then that
" our Dr. writes not in Engliſh, but in a Lan-
" guage farther remov'd from the true En-
" gliſh Idiom than the Doric Greek was from
" the Attic (*c*)? Why does Dr. *Bentley*, an (*c*) Ibid.
Engliſhman, write a New Language, which *P.* 40, 41.
no Engliſhman before ever wrote or ſpoke?
How comes his Speech neither to be that
of the Learned, nor that of his Country? but
a mix'd particolour'd Dialect, form'd out of
both?

both? " Pray, how came that Idiom to be
" the Court-language at St. *James's* * ?
* Dissert. p. 41. But should we allow, that in some Past Age
such a Manner of Speech might have pre-
vail'd among Englishmen, yet there will still
" lye another Indictment against the Credit
" of these Dissertations, on the account of
" the English of the true Age of Dr. *Bentley*
" not being there represented, but a more
" Recent Idiom and Style, that by the whole
" Thread and Colour of it betrays it self to
" be written in an Age very distant from His.
" Every Living Language, like the Perspiring
" Bodies of Living Creatures, is in perpetual
" Motion and Alteration; which in Tract of
" time makes as observable a Change in the
" Air and Features of a Language, as Age
" makes in the Lines and Mien of a Face. All
" are sensible of this in their own Native
" Tongues where continual Use makes every
" man a Critic: so that there is no English-
" man but thinks himself able from the very
" Turn and Fashion of the Style to distin-
" guish a fresh Composition from another an
† Dissert. p. 57. " hundred Years old †. Now when we
compare these Dissertations with the Writings
of Archbishop *Tillotson*, Bishop *Sprat*, Sir *Wil-
liam Temple*, and Others, we find the Style of
that Age had a quite different Turn and Fa-
shion from that of our Dissertator. " Should I
" affirm that I know the Novity of these Dis-
" sertations from the whole Body and Form
" of the Work, none perhaps would be con-
" vinced by it, but those that, without my
" Indication, could discover it by themselves.
" I shall let that alone then, and point out

" only

" only a few Marks and Moles in 'em, " which every one that pleaſes may know " them by *. In the 14th page, the moſt *timid*; for which the Ancients would have ſaid, the moſt *doubtful*, or *ſcrupulous*: in the 46th, *Negoce*; for which they would have ſaid *Dealing*, *Commerce*, or *Intercourſe*: in the 47th, *repudiated their Vernacular Idiom*; for which they would have ſaid, *laid aſide their Mother-Tongue*: in the 16th page, a ſmall *Doſe* of Sagacity; for which they perhaps would have ſaid a ſmall *Share*: in the 59th, *Manufacture*, for the forging of a Story; never us'd by the Ancients in that Senſe, but always for the work of the *Hand*, not that of the *Brain*. They that will make the ſearch, may find more of this ſort, as *brittle Compliments* (*a*), *incurable Botches* (*b*), *broaching of expreſſions* (*c*), *lopping off branches of Evidence* (*d*), *a Scene of Putid Formality* (*e*); *Men ſpringing up like Muſhrooms out of Rotten Paſſages of Authors* (*f*), and many others of the ſame Strain: " but I ſup- " poſe theſe are ſufficient to unmask the Re- " cent Sophiſt under the Perſon of the Old " Librarian (*g*).

* Differt. P. 52.

(*a*) P. 22.
(*b*) Ibid.
(*c*) P. 28.
(*d*) P. 29.
(*e*) P. 58.
(*f*) P. 118.
(*g*) P. 53.

But were it poſſible to produce an Author of the ſame Country and Age with Dr. *Bentley*, who wrote in the Language of this Diſſertation, yet ſtill it is abſurd to think that one of his Education, Character, and Station ſhould be the Author of it. For Dr. *Bentley* is known to have appertain'd to the Family of a Right Reverend Prelate, who was the Great Ornament of that Age, to have had an Univerſity-Education, to have convers'd much in the City and at Court; and with

theſe

these advantages he could not but be more refin'd than the Writer of this piece of Criticism: who by his manner of expressing himself shews, that he was taken up with quite other thoughts and different Images from those that use to fill the Heads of such as have had a Learned and Liberal Education. For this Sophist is a perfect *Dorian* in his Language, in his Thoughts, and in his Breeding. The familiar expressions, of *taking one tripping* (a), *coming off with a whole Skin* (b), *minding his Nitts* (c), *a friend at a pinch* (d), *going to blows* (e), *setting horses together* (f), and *going to pass* (g); with others borrow'd from the Sports and Employments of the Country, shew our Author to have been accustom'd to another sort of Exercise, than that of the Schools.

(a) P. 27.
(b) P. 32.
(c) P. 34.
(d) P. 36.
(e) P. 57.
(f) P. 65.
(g) P. 63.

" Some Persons perhaps may Gratuitously " undertake to Apologize for Dr. *Bentley* a- " bout this matter of the Dialect *: they may plead in his behalf, that he was born in some Village remote from Town, and bred among the Peasantry while Young; and for that reason " might ever after have a Twang of the " Country Dialect. Now if any one know " an Express Testimony that he was bred in " the Country, he can teach me more than I " at present remember. This I know in ge- " neral † from *Anthony Wood* and others, that many have come from the Employments of the Country to be Doctors in the University; " and so he may come in among the rest, " But then must his Language be ever after- " wards Dorick, because he had once Footing " in a Country Town *? The same Author tells

* Dissert. p. 43.

† P. 45.

* Ibid.

tells us of ſeveral born and bred in the Country, who yet in Proceſs of Time have learnt to ſpeak a different Dialect from that of their Mother-Village. "Why then muſt "Dr. *Bentley*'s Dialect ſtill needs be Doric? "and that ſo tenaciouſly, that twenty Years "living in the Univerſities and City could "not at all alter it in one of that Education †? † P. 46.

He was part of that time a Library-keeper to a Learned Dean, and afterwards to His Majeſty; a Member of one Univerſity, and a Sojourner in the other; a Chaplain in Ordinary to the King, and a Tutor in extraordinary to a Young Gentleman: "and could not that "Perpetual Negoce and Converſe with Gentlemen and Scholars bring his Mouth by "degrees to ſpeak a little finer? Would "not he that aim'd at the Reputation of a "Polite Scholar, and for that reaſon had apply'd himſelf in a particular manner to the "*belles Lettres*, have quitted his Old Country "Dialect, for that of a *Londoner*, a Gentleman, and a Scholar? and not by every "word he ſpake make the Ridiculous Diſcovery of his being a Perfect Stranger * to * P. 46.
all Polite Learning, and Gentleman-like Converſation?

"But let us hear a Second Apology that "may be made for the Doriſm of Dr. *Bentley*: He may perhaps be defended from "the like Practiſe of others, who being *Londoners* born or bred, have repudiated the "Vernacular Idiom of the City for that of "the Country; as Sir *Roger L'Eſtrange* in his "*Æſop*'s Fables, Sir *John Suckling* in his *Ballad*, and Mr. *Dryden* in his *Harveſt home*.

"So

" So that tho' Dr. *Bentley* be suppos'd to be a " Native of *London*, or bred Liberally, yet " here is an Excuse for his quitting the City " Language. But I conceive, with submissi- " on, that this argument is built upon such " Instances as are quite aliene from the case " of our Dissertator. For Doric might in- " deed be proper for Fables, or Ballads, " where Brutes, or Peasants are brought in " speaking; or for Scotch Songs, and the " Chorus of a Comedy, on the account of " the Doric Music: but it has not Grace and " Majesty enough for the Subject Dr. *Bentley* " is engag'd in. What affinity then is there " between Dr. *Bentley*'s case, and that of Wri- " ters of Fables, Ballads, and Comedies? " what mighty Motives can Here be for assu- " ming a Foreign Dialect? His Pieces are " dated in the midst of *London*, directed to " the very next Street, address'd to a Scho- " lar, about a Controversie in Criticism, de- " sign'd for the view of men of Literature, " and not written to express the humor of " the Country, or to entertain men of Low " Rank and Character. If any will still ex- " cuse the Dr. for Dorizing in these Circum- " stances, 'tis hard to deny them the glory of " being the humblest of his Admirers and " Vassals (*a*).

(*a*) Differ. p. 50, 51.

The same Apology that is made for the Doric way of speaking may perhaps be urg'd also in favour of that *Mix'd Language* which runs throughout these Dissertations. The Speech of *Alexander Bendo* by the Earl of *Rochester*, the Pedant in *Ben Johnson*, and other Writers of Comedies, do shew, that the Au-

thor

thor of theſe Reflections, tho' he carries this way of ſpeaking farther than any ever before him did, is not Singular in the Uſe of it: but this Plea alſo will admit of a Ready Anſwer; that tho' this manner of ſpeaking may be proper for Mountebanks and Pedants, whoſe buſineſs it is to appear Learned to the Ignorant, yet that does not juſtifie the uſe of it by one, who was reckon'd a Scholar, in a Diſcourſe addreſs'd only to Scholars. "'Tis very "ſtrange that a Critic, and ſuch a Critic as "Dr. *Bentley*, ſhould ſo doat on the Dialect "peculiar to Pedantry, who was ſo eminent-"ly μισο — the hater of Pedants (*a*)? and ſo well known to be ſo, that even our Sophiſt in theſe very Diſſertations repreſents him as One whoſe Aim, Profeſſion, and Imployment it was *to pull off the Diſguiſe from thoſe little Pedants, that have ſtalkt ſo long about in the Apparel of Heroes* (*). (*a*) Diſſer. p. 41. (*) Ibid. p. 29.

"But I love to deal Ingenuouſly; and will "not conceal One Argument, which tho' it "will not do the work, let it go however as "far as it can (*b*), in favour of their Opinion who may aſcribe theſe Diſſertations to Dr. *Bentley*. There is ſtill extant a *Letter* of Dr. *Bentley*'s to Dr. *John Mill*, which is confeſs'd to be Genuine, in which there are frequent Scraps of Greek intermix'd with Latin; which might give occaſion to our Sophiſt to think that a *Cento* of Different Languages was a Characteriſtic of this Author: but the caſe of this Epiſtle is widely different from that of theſe Diſſertations. For the Author of the *Epiſtle* writing to One who had a particular Value for the Greek Tongue, (*b*) P. 25.

ſhew'd

shew'd an Excellent Judgment in passing such a Compliment on that Language, as to use it instead of Latin, even where Latin would have done as well. But besides, he had occasion to express himself in Terms of Archness and Waggery, which the Latin Tongue would not come up to. For *Johannule* was not in use, and therefore *Iohannides*, or *Little Jacky*, was the only word that could serve to express that in short, which the Latins cannot say but by a Periphrasis. Whereas these *Dissertations* were design'd for the benefit of English Readers, who had as great an Esteem for their own Tongue, as either for Greek, or Latin; and the Uncouth Words here interspers'd do not add any Beauty to the Style, nor do they convey the Author's thoughts to our Understanding with more Dispatch or Clearness than plain English would do.

I doubt not but our Sophist had that Letter of Dr. *Bentley* to Dr. *Mill before his Pen* (*a*), when he counterfeited these Dissertations in the Name of that Reverend Doctor. For 'tis very observable that the Preface of this Letter to Mr. *Wotton* is borrow'd from the Preface of that to Dr. *Mill*; which begins with the Author's remembring a Discourse between Him and Dr. *Mill* about *Malela* (*b*), and a Promise that Dr. *Bentley* had upon that occasion made to his Friend, of which he was to acquit himself in that Letter: this our Sophist transcribes, changing only the Names, and ascribes it to the same Dr. *Bentley*. Had that Dr. really wrote these Dissertations,

(*a*) P. 36.

(*b*) Or Malelas, or Malala, or Malalas: *for that weighty Controversie about the right Spelling this Word is not yet fully decided.*

tations, his Invention was not ſo narrow and ſtinted, that he ſhould be forc'd to borrow from Himſelf; eſpecially having ſo large an Acquaintance, as he appears to have had, with Works of the ſame Stamp and Character with the Epiſtle he was writing; as *Prefaces*, *Prolegomena*, *Apparatus's*, *Introductions*, &c: but it was Natural Enough for a Sophiſt in his *Mock-Bentley* to *filch* an *Exordium* from the Undiſputed Writings of the true Dr. *Bentley*.

The ſame Letter to Dr. *Mill*, which has furniſh'd us already with one Detection of the Impoſture, will, if ſtrictly examin'd, make a Second Confeſſion from theſe Words. *Hæc habui*, Milli *Jucundiſſime*, *qua de* Alcmæone & Alcmæonide, *ore ut opinor alio indicta dicerem: non enim placet eorum ratio, qui cùm mera Cornicula ſint, emendicatis hinc inde Plumis germanos Pavones ſe pollicentur* (*a*). "Now here agen "am I concern'd for our Sophiſt, that he is "taken tripping. For he values himſelf "highly, and *expects great Thanks for a Diſ-* "*covery* (*b*) about *Ocellus Lucanus*, which had been long before made and publiſh'd by *Vizzanius*, in his Edition of that Author; and whence 'tis evident it was tranſcrib'd by our Sophiſt into his Diſſertation. Now would Dr. *Bentley*, who profeſſes himſelf ſuch an Enemy to borrowing, have thus plum'd himſelf in borrow'd Feathers? "It is a very "Notable Diſcovery, and we are much "oblig'd to the Author of it: but then there "was either a ſtrange Jumping of Good "Wits, or the Diſſertator is a Sorry Plagia- "ry. What ſhall we ſay to this matter?

(*a*) P. 20.

(*b*) P. 47.

" Dr. *Bentley* had the Character of a man of
" Probity and Parts, who had neither Incli-
" nation nor Need to filch the Sayings of
(a) P. 33. " Others (a). Those must be unacquainted with his Character, who think he would say in his Own Name what he found said to his Hands. In the Letter to Dr. *Mill* he omits several things very proper to his purpose, *ne fortè qui Me minus norunt*, Pauli *me* Leopardi
(b) Ep. p. 4. *Scrinia compilare existiment* (b). Would he be there so afraid of being thought to transcribe *Leopardus*? and would he here value himself upon Discovering first what he plainly copies from *Vizzanius*? Must those who think he could borrow be such as did *not know* him? and can we, when we know him upon his Own Declaration to be so averse from borrowing, imagine he would borrow That from another, for which he solemnly bespeaks Thanks from the Learned World? " This
" bears hard upon the Author of the Disser-
" tations: but how can we help it? he
" should have minded his Hitts better, when
" he was minded to act the Doctor.

But that Letter to Dr. *Mill* will afford us still greater Conviction that this Dissertation could not be the Genuine Work of Dr. *Bentley*. For that Letter, in the Page above mention'd represents Dr. *Bentley* proving, that he could not easily be deceiv'd in knowing whether a Greek Verse were ascrib'd to its proper Author: *Nam in his Rebus verba mihi dari haud facilè patior; qui, ut scis, Fragmenta omnium Poetarum Græcorum cum Emendationibus, ac Notis, Grande Opus, edere constituerant: nunc,*
(c) Ep. p. 20. *ut ajunt, ἀπὸ σκοπῆς, ἀπὸ δίαιτης* (c). Now is it pro-

probable, that One who had collected the Fragments of all the Greek Poets, amended them, and wrote Notes upon them, could miſtake *Empedocles* for an *Epic Poet?* But I ſhall not inſiſt upon this; ſince the Paſſage produc'd carries in it a more Direct and Expreſs Proof that Dr. *Bentley* could not write theſe Diſſertations. He had deſign'd once it ſeems, to publiſh his Grand Work, the Fragments of the Greek Poets: but he was now, he tells us, engag'd in another way of Life, and muſt therefore apply himſelf to another ſort of Studies: for that I take to be the Import of the Greek Proverb. Now the Diſſertations in diſpute bear date after this Declaration; they pretend to be written by *Richard Bentley* Dr. of Divinity, and Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majeſty; they would be thought to come into the world ſome time after his Lectures were printed in Defence of Religion. He was now therefore engag'd in another Profeſſion; and would not, we may be ſure, meddle with a Subject ſo foreign to the buſineſs of a Divine, nor handle it in a manner ſo ill becoming that Character. He who ſcrupl'd publiſhing thoſe Fragments, which might have been of good Uſe to the Learned, and might ſome of them have fallen in with Divinity, would much leſs have taken up with ſuch Thin *Diet*, and miſpent ſo much of his precious Time upon ſo fruitleſs Enquiries as thoſe are which are purſu'd in theſe ſeveral Diſſertations. "There is another thing, beſides a "pretty Invention, uſeful for a Lyar, and "that is a Good Memory. We will ſuppoſe "our Author to have once known ſomething

" of this Declaration of Dr. *Bentley*; but he " had, it ſeems, unhappily forgot it, when " he aſcrib'd theſe Pieces to him *.

* Diſſert. p. 17.

The Sophiſt is not more happy in perſonating Dr. *Bentley*, when thro' the whole Courſe of thoſe Diſſertations he repreſents him as a Fierce and Angry Writer; and One, who when he thinks he has an advantage over another Man, gives him no Quarter. For the Writer of the Epiſtle to Dr. *Mill*, when he had juſt occaſion to be very Severe on ſome, who had taken wrong meaſures in deducing the Etymology of a Greek Word, thus repreſſes his Indignation: *Sed nolo aliquid inclementer dicere; non noſtrum eſt κερίνειν ἀμπάλλεσθαι* †. This ſhews him to have been a Man of Temper, and Good Nature: but our Sophiſt repreſents him as one that has no Mercy upon his Adverſary, when he thinks he has him in his power. The ſuppos'd Editors of *Phalaris* for an imagin'd miſtake in a point of Criticiſm are expos'd as *Nonſenſical Blunderers*, Perſons who had *neither Skill nor Induſtry*, neither *Knowledge nor Ingenuity*; to be like *Leucon's Aſſes*, a *degree below Sorry Criticks*, to write *directly againſt Grammar and Common Senſe*; and are ſet out to the world under this Low and Rude Similitude: *Here are Your Workmen, to mend an Author, as bungling Tinkers do Old Kettles!* What a difference is there between the Two Letter-writers? Mr. *Bentley* is calm and forgiving, but Dr. *Bentley* is furious and unrelenting: Dr. *Mill*'s Friend ſcorns to inſult over the Proſtrate; but Mr. *Wotton*'s friend purſues his Blow: " and don't You yet begin " to ſuſpect the Credit of the Diſſertations *?

† Ep. p. 4.

* Diſſ. p. 62

Dr.

Dr. *Bentley* was celebrated amongſt the Learned Men of his own and other Countries for one, who was much vers'd in the Learned Languages: and, as it appears by his Letter to Dr. *Mill*, he was very converſant in *Suidas*, *Heſychius*, and other Greek *Vocabularies*, *Onomaſticons*, *Etymologicons*, *Lexicons*, *Gloſſaries*, *Nomenclators*, and *Scholia*; ſo that he muſt at leaſt have been acquainted with the Significations of Greek Words: but it appears from what this Sophiſt offers about the Senſe of ſome Greek words * which he finds in *Phalaris*, that he was not only a perfect Stranger to the beſt Claſſic Authors, but that he wanted that Light which any Ordinary Dictionary would have afforded him. The Librarian was ſo well read in One of theſe Inſtructive Writers, *Heſychius*, as to aſſure Dr. *Mill*, between Verſe and Proſe, that whenever a New Edition of that book came forth, he could, if he would, correct five thouſand faults in it, more or leſs.

* *From the 62d to the 68th page of this Book.*

Id Tibi de plano poſſum promittere, Milli, *Quinque plus minus millia mendorum Me correcturum eſſe, ſi libuerit, quæ aliorum ὐσυχίᾳ & laborioſam diligentiam hactenus illuſerunt* †. † Epp. 39.

Now could any thing that actually *is* in *Heſychius*, eſcape his knowledge, who had ſuch a Deep Inſight into what *is not*, but *ought* to be there? could He who had diſcover'd what had eſcap'd the Utmoſt Diligence of Others, miſs what was obvious to every one that look'd into *Heſychius*? Would Dr. *Bentley* have given us ſuch a Caſt of his Skill in conſtruing

ſtruing Greek Words, as to tell us, that διώκειν *anciently ſignified to purſue, when that which fled fear'd and ſhunn'd the purſuer*; and that it *never* ſignified to *follow*, in any other Senſe; when *Heſychius* gives us no other words for διώκει, but ἕλκει, ἐπιτίθησι, which are far from a Perſecuting Senſe?

Dr. *Bentley* is known to have liv'd in the ſame Age, and at the ſame Time, that the Edition of *Phalaris*, with which this Sophiſt is ſo angry, came out: it appears, from the Editor's Preface, that the Dr. being then Library-keeper at *St. James's*, deny'd a Common Favour to the Editor, which is complain'd of in that Preface: This doubtleſs gave occaſion to our Sophiſt to forge theſe Diſſertations in the Dr's name, to ſhow his pretended reſentments of that Complaint. Now the Dr. himſelf could not be ignorant, that this Edition was put forth by Mr. *Boyle*, whoſe Name it ſtill bears. But Our Sophiſt, who liv'd at a greater diſtance from thoſe Times, ſuppoſes it the Joynt-Work of ſeveral: he talks of *our Late Editors*, of *thoſe Great Genius's*, *with whom Learning, that is leaving the World, has taken up her Laſt Reſidence*; of *thoſe Annotators*, of our *Ingenious Tranſlators* (a): whereas theſe *Editors*, *Genius's*, *Annotators*, *Tranſlators*, could not but be known to one that then liv'd, and were known to Dr. *Bentley* (as appears by a MS Letter of his to Mr. *Boyle*, now in being) to be one and the ſame Perſon. It is true, that in the Preface to the Edition there are theſe Expreſſions, *Quantum ſcimus*, and *Noſtro Labore*; and in the Dedication, *Tuâ ope adjutus*, which might lead our Sophiſt into a miſtake, that

(a) Diſſer. p. 66, 71.

that this Edition was the Work of More than One; and that the Perſon, to whom it is dedicated, had aſſiſted in it: as if it were unuſual for the Plural Number to be put for the Singular; or as if a Perſon in that Station could no otherwiſe aſſiſt a Young Gentleman of his College in the Edition of a Book, than by collating Manuſcripts, tranſlating the Text, and writing Comments.

Dr. *Bentley* is known to have enjoy'd the advantage of a Public Lecture inſtituted by the Honourable Mr. *Robert Boyle*, and by reaſon of that Poſt muſt be ſuppos'd to have had a due reſpect for his Name and Family; ſo that it cannot rationally be preſum'd, he would treat a Gentleman, who had the Honour to be nearly related to that Noble Perſon, with ſo much Contempt and Indignity, as is plainly expreſs'd in ſeveral parts of that Diſſertation.

Dr. *Bentley* did alſo flouriſh during the Life of Sir *William Temple*, whilſt that Eminent Perſon was in great Reputation for the Signal and Extraordinary Services he had done for the Proteſtant Intereſt, to the Engliſh Nation, and to the King who then reign'd; as alſo for his Learned Writings, which were then in very great Eſteem amongſt all thoſe who had a true reliſh for Sound Senſe, and Noble Thoughts, expreſs'd with all the Beauty and Force of proper and ſignificant Language. Now tho' the Dr. might without any offence differ in his Sentiments from that Worthy Gentleman, yet it is not credible that a Scholar, a Courtier, and a Divine would ſo far break in upon all the Rules of Modeſty, De-

cency, and Civility, as to inſult over a Perſon of Sir *William*'s Character, and Merit, as an Ignorant and Illiterate Pretender to Learning; who *could neither diſcover the true Time, nor the true Value of his Authors; and whoſe Choice of* Phalaris *and* Æſop, *as then extant, for two great inimitable Originals, was a piece of Criticiſm of a peculiar Complexion, and muſt proceed from a Singularity of Palate and Judgment.*

" It muſt needs be a great Wonder to thoſe " who think theſe Diſſertations Genuine, " how or where they have been conceal'd; " and in what Secret Shop, or unknown Cor- " ner of the World they have lain hid, ſo " that no one has ever taken notice of 'em " for ſo many Ages. Had theſe Diſſertations " been ſeen and read, ſomebody ſure would " have quoted ſomewhat out of 'em; eſpe- " cially ſince ſo many have had occaſion to
(*a*) Differ. p. 63. " do ſo (*a*): for all thoſe who have written concerning Sophiſms, and Ill Conſequences in arguing, might have furniſh'd themſelves from hence with all Kinds of Looſe and Incoherent Thinking. And thoſe that have publiſh'd their Cenſures upon the Incongruities of Language, and Innovations in Speech, might from every Page of this Author have fetch'd proper Inſtances of the Groſſeſt Improprieties.

" So that, by their Silence and Prætermiſſion,
(*b*) Differ. p. 64. " they do as good as declare expreſly, that " they never ſaw our Diſſertation (*b*).

But that which ought to weigh moſt with thoſe who have any Honour for Dr. *Bentley*, toward clearing him from any ſuſpicion of having written theſe Pieces, is this Conſideration; that That Learned Doctor was choſen

out

out by the then Fathers of the Church, as a fit perſon to vindicate the Truth of Religion againſt Atheiſts, Deiſts, and all other Oppoſers of Divine Revelation: whereas this Sophiſt is found to make uſe of ſuch Arguments (*a*) to diſprove the Epiſtles of *Phalaris*, as are of Equal weight to prove the Writings of *Moſes* and the New Teſtament to be of much Later date, than they can be conſiſtently with the Pretences of the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Religion. " So little regard had " this Bold Writer to fit his Diſcourſes to " the Character of that Reverend and Lear- " ned Perſon; and I have had too much Re- " gard to Him, in giving him the Honour " and Patience of ſo Long an Examina- " tion (*b*).

(*a*) *Vide* p. 121ſt *of his Book.*

(*b*) Differ. p. 65.

Since

Since I have had the Patience to examine all the tedious *Proofs* Dr. *Bentley* has heap'd together againſt the *Epiſtles*, which I was not in the leaſt concern'd to vindicate; I am oblig'd to ſay ſomething to his *Criticiſms* upon the *Edition* that relate entirely to my Self. I ſhall conſider 'em with the ſame Indifference that I did his Arguments: for as I never profeſs'd my ſelf a Patron of *Phalaris*, ſo neither was it ever in my Thoughts to ſet up for Exactneſs in that Dry Sort of Learning. I enter'd upon the Work meerly as an Exerciſe of my Pen; I ſaw that Life and Smartneſs, which I ſtill reliſh in theſe Epiſtles, quite loſt in the Looſe *Periphraſes*, and *plain Country Latin* (as the Dr. calls it) of the former Interpreters. This put me upon trying whether I could expreſs the *Style* as well as the Senſe of the Original in another Language; and repreſent it with ſuch advantage, that They who are no Maſters of Greek might ſee ſome faint reſemblance of the Author's Spirit and Genius, in a Tranſlation: in which whether I have been ſucceſsful, and to what degree, muſt be left to the different Humors, and Opinions of Readers. I abhorr Vanity, and the more ſince I have read Dr. *Bentley*'s Book, where I ſee it makes ſo unbecoming a Figure: yet This I will be bold to ſay, that even in thoſe Tranſlations of the Greek Authors, which are eſteem'd the Beſt, would a man of ſome know-

knowledge in Criticiſm exerciſe all the ſpite and skill he has that way to find out Miſtakes, he might be able to muſter up ſuch a Plentiful Number of 'em as would keep my Poor Verſion and Notes in Countenance. I queſtion not but there are Errors and Overſights enow in my Tranſlation; I was very Young when I did it; and, to confeſs the Truth, after I had got a little way into it, and made my firſt Eſſays, went thro' the Reſt of it without any Great Guſt: and 'tis no wonder therefore if I ſhould not be awake ſometimes in a Work that I was not very fond of. However, as Many, and as Eaſie to be found as my Faults are, Dr. *Bentley* has yet had the Ill Luck to miſs 'em; and to except againſt ſuch Paſſages as can, I think, to any Unprejudic'd Man, be fairly accounted for. The Town I own is Weak and Defenceleſs enough in conſcience; but he has had the Judgment to attack it on that ſide, where perhaps it lies leaſt expos'd. Upon *Scouring the firſt Epiſtle* (as he Cleanlily expreſſes himſelf) he finds theſe Words there, ψυχῆς δ νόσον ἰατρὸς ἰᾶται θάνατος, ὃν ἀνηνύσθιτον &c. ἀσθένεια. Which, in my Latin, runns, [*Animi autem Morbum Medica ſanat Mors, quam quidem nulli grævem*, &c. *expecta*]. He is pleas'd to render it thus, [*For a Diſeaſe of the Soul the only Phyſician is Death: do You therefore expect a moſt painful one*] and ſays, My Tranſlation of ἀνηνύσθιτον [by *nulli grævem*] *produces a flat and far-fetch'd Senſe* †. I muſt own I do not yet ſee why it is more *flat* to ſay a Villain ſhall dye an *Unlamented Death*, than that he ſhall dye a *Painful* one: and I as little apprehend why he calls this a *far-fetch'd* Senſe;

† Diſſert. p. 69.

Senſe; I ſuppoſe he cannot mean by a *far-fetch'd* Senſe, a Senſe that the Word ἀνεπαχθὴς is not commonly us'd in, becauſe I never could meet with it us'd in any other Senſe, till Now he has thought fit to tranſlate it *moſt painful*. All the Criticks before him render it by *non gravis*, *non invidioſus*, or by ſome word Equivalent to theſe: and *Hermogenes* thought this a proper ſenſe of the word, when he intitul'd a Chapter περὶ τοῦ ἀνεπαχθῶς ἑαυτὸν ἐπαινεῖν; which I would adviſe the Dr. to read, not only to get a better acquaintance with the Word in queſtion, but to learn too the modeſty and diſcretion not to commend himſelf ſo often, with ſo very ill a Grace. I am ſure he wants to be taught this; and ſince he has juſt now taught me what I knew nothing of before, I could do no leſs than make him this Grateful Return.

He goes on to inſtruct me. *The Greek*, ſays he, *is in the Superlative degree, let 'em put it then*, nulli graviſſimam, *and 'twill ſhew 'em the Error of their Verſion* †; that is, let Me tranſlate it for 'em, and I'll undertake to make neither Grammar nor Senſe of it. But if he will give me leave to tranſlate it my ſelf, ſince it muſt be in the Superlative degree, inſtead of *nulli gravem*, I would put *minimè invidioſam*; and then I do not yet ſee any Error in the Verſion: and I am the more inclin'd to think there's none, becauſe the Dr. ſlides off, and takes Refuge in his Strong and Secret Hold, the MSS. *The MS.* he ſays, *reads it* ὡς ἂν ἐπαχθέστατον; *and They* (as he calls *Me*) *might have embrac'd this Reading, when they ſaw it there.* What MS. is this? None of the *Body-MSS* read it ſo; nor

† Diſſert. p. 69.

nor the *Arundel*, a Collation of which the Learned *Dean of York* ſent me, after my Edition was finiſh'd. Sure the Dr. cannot mean the *King's MS*; he knows I never ſaw That my ſelf; and I hope I am not anſwerable for my Collator's Eyes. And, ſince No-body can ſee it but Dr. *Bentley*, I have no great Reaſon to depend upon His Ingenuity. However, if this be the Reading of the King's MS, 'tis frivolous and fit to be neglected: for to Me the Common Reading ſeems to have rather a *Quicker Senſe*, and (having ſhewn Dr. *Bentley* to be no great Maſter in Propriety of Speech) I may venture to ſay, as much *Propriety*. Perhaps the Dr. might have thought ſo too, but that he has a Peculiar Fondneſs for the *Parapleromatick Particle* ἀν, which he takes to be *a rare and quaint uſage* (*a*): and having met with it Here therefore, is reſolv'd not to part with it. To diminiſh his fondneſs for it, I promiſe to furniſh him upon demand with 30 or 40 Inſtances from *Homer*, and the *Greek Teſtament* (to go no further), where *the Particle* ἀν is us'd as *Parapleromatically* every whit as it would be here, ſhould his Reading prevail.

(*a*) Diſſert. *p.* 70.

But to wave entring into a Controverſie with him about Particles; let us ſee whether he be not as Exquiſite a Judge in *Latin* as he is in *Greek*: He charges me with *Barbariſm*, *Nonſenſe*, and *New Diſcoveries* in Language for tranſlating *diſtrahuntur in diverſos*, *Scelera non invita*; for he is very poſitive that *Invitus always* means the Agent, is *always* ſpoken of the Perſon, *never* of the Thing, *&c.* But I hope *Propertius*, who liv'd in the Pureſt Age of Latin,

tin, may be preſum'd to underſtand his own Tongue as well as Dr. *Bentley*: He (*El.* 16; *L.* 1.) expoſtulating with an Unkind Miſtreſs, ſays, that tho' ſhe was Cruel and Unrelenting, yet if ſhe did but hear his Complaint,

Non — ipſa ſuos poterit compeſcere Ocellos
Surget & invitis ſpiritus in Lacrymis.

Is *Invitis* here joyn'd with the *Perſon* or the *Thing*? if *Propertius* had ſaid, as he does in other places, that Tears would flow *ab Invitis Oculis*; tho' an Eye be improperly call'd a *Perſon*, yet in that caſe I might allow it to be taken *Perſonally*: or had he attributed any *Action* to Tears; as, if he had ſaid, *invita ſurgent Lacryma*, *Lacrymæ* might be conſider'd as an *Agent*: but as it ſtands here, *Invita Lacryma* muſt be render'd *Involuntary Tears*; and to explain it otherwiſe is, I think, contrary to Good Senſe and Good Language too. Were Dr. *Bentley* as well acquainted with the Latin of the Great Men in *Auguſtus*'s Age, as with that of the Pedants in This, he would have another Taſt, and another Style: To know the Grammar of a Tongue, and to have a juſt ſenſe of the Proprieties and Elegancies of it, are two different things; as different almoſt as Conſtruing *Euclid*'s Words, and being Maſter of his Demonſtrations. Any-body that will take the pains may be Critically exact in the Signification and Syntax of Words; but to enter into the Spirit and Beauty of good writing is an Happineſs that None have but thoſe who are Born with it; nor All of them neither: for a Long Converſation

sation with Bad books may destroy a good Natural Taste. I don't say, this is Dr. *Bentley's* case; for I am not a Judge whether he ever had any.

To come a little nearer to his Ages of Latin, I will give him a Couple of Instances of the same kind out of *Statius*; One of them from the 9th *Thebais*, where Young *Dryas*, after he was mortally wounded, sends this Message to his Mother,

—— *Merui, Genetrix, pœnas; invita capessens*
Arma Puer rapui, nec Te revinente quievi. v. 891.

Invita is here apply'd not to the *Person* his Mother, but to the *Thing* Arms taken up against her Will. In the 7th *Thebais* the *Grecians* are encourag'd by *Jupiter* to make a furious assault upon *Thebes*; and *Bacchus* in his Speech to *Jupiter* on this occasion, says,

Esto olim invitum *jaculatus nubibus ignem;*
Credimus: en iterum atra refers incendia rerum,
Nec Styge juratus, nec Pelicis Arte rogatus?
v. 158.

Jupiter, by his Vow to *Semele*, was oblig'd, against his own Inclination, to grant what she ask'd: and therefore the destruction he brought upon her was *Involuntary*: I think *Invitum* can bear no other sense here, and I therefore leave these Passages with Dr. *Bentley* to consider at his Leisure; Let him try his Skill upon 'em next time the angry Fit of Criticism returns.

I see there is no way of pleasing an Incens'd

cens'd Dissertator; I have just clear'd my self from the Imputation of using a Word in a *different* sense from other Writers; and now he accuses me for using a Word in the *same* sense with all the Authors that ever writ. I translate ἐγείρειν *Hortaris*, which I interpret by *Provocas*, as *Budæus* does; who in his Learned Commentary has these words, ἐγείρω, *provocare, ciere*; & *usus est satis frequens*: and I translate it so, because I could find no other Signification of it in any Greek Writer; and Dr. *Bentley* himself owns as much, that it is not otherwise us'd by *any of the Ancients*. Now I never designing to make a Noise with the Corrections and Improvements of Old Vocabularies, was contented to use words in the same Sense that every-body had us'd 'em before me; and for this Error of mine my Indictment runs, that I am *an Illiterate Father of an absurd, ridiculous, and incongruous Sense upon my Author*. My Plea is, that it seems to Me no more absurd, or ridiculous, that *Phalaris* should say to one of his Enemies, *You provoke me to be cruel*, than that he should say (as Dr. *Bentley* would have him) *You upbraid me with Cruelty*. And I believe his Cavil against the *Synaxis* of ἐπὶ ἐμοὶ ἐγείρειν is no better grounded than that against the *Sense*. He won't indeed find ἐγείρω in his Grammar with a Dative Case, but *he may please to inlarge it from this very place* *: and as for his ἐπ' ἐμοί, or ἐφ' ἐμοί, we have no occasion for either of 'em: in the days of *Sophocles* ταῦτά σε ἐγείρει was no more absurd and incongruous, than *Qua me hortaris* was in *Tully's*. But Dr. *Bentley* thinks he *has shewn already, that* ἐγείρω *signifies*

* Dissert. p. 75.

misuse reprobate; where has he shewn it? he has no where said any thing of it, but in the 52d page; and there he only says, that *ἐγκαλεῖν to accuse, is an Innovation in Language, for which the Ancients us'd ἐπιτιμᾶν*: so that positively to avert, and assume the thing in question is in his Language to *shew*, and prove it. Let us see now whether his Second Thoughts furnish him with any better proof of *ἐγκαλεῖν* signifying to *accuse*. One would expect that he should produce the Authority of some Greek Author, that uses *ἐγκαλεῖν* in this sense: but he has given this argument quite another turn, and proves, that 'tis us'd so here, *because 'tis never us'd so by any ancient Author before the Sophist* †; he might have added too, nor by any Modern Author since. This is a surprizing way of arguing, but I find it familiar to Dr. *Bentley*; he has another jest of this strain in the 115th page: he says there, *One may know Sabinus Pollo to be a Roman*; how so? does he find any such Family among the *Romans*? no, that's too Obvious a Way of arguing for a man of his Parts: he knows him to be a *Roman*, because he *does not find such a Family as the Sabinii, or such a Surname as* Pollo: and he improves this Acquaintance with *Sabinus* so far, that within Three pages he calls him *his Friend Sabinus Pollo*. Such are the New Ways of Reasoning made use of by this Incomprehensible Author. He has furnish'd us with several; and, to shew that he is not yet exhausted, he brings this argument to prove that *ἐγκαλεῖν* signifies to *reproach*, *ἐπιτιμᾶν* and *vice versâ* signifie *to reproach*; therefore *ἐγκαλεῖν* does so too: and

Dissert. p. 71.

† Ibid. p. 72.

in the same Paragraph, he after the same manner makes it out, that *Patere* is *non persevere*, is not *Idem exactly the same with* pertendo (meaning, I suppose, that *Ire* is *per*, and *Tetendo*) *and is not* pertendo *to persevere?* I always thought that *Use* was the only Rule and Measure of the Signification of words; but Dr. *Bentley*, a great Adventurer in new ways of thinking, will determine it by dint of Argument. Would he allow Others to argue as He does, from One Compound Word to Another, and from One Language to Another, we might *enlarge our Dictionaries* without End; and soon produce not only (what he pretends to *) *five thousand*, but five Millions of Emendations and Additions to *Hesychius*; tho' not such as are worthy to keep Company with the Admirable Bishop *Pearson*'s Observations on that Author: and therefore should they hereafter come together (as 'tis said they will), and should the *Bisset*'s Name not happen to be set to His part (as 'tis possible it may not); it will be no difficult matter to distinguish between 'em. According to the Dr's Rule (not to go far from the words he plays with) because *Insilire* signifies *to skip*, therefore *by a Like Metaphor, and Analogy, we may use* Insilire *to express the same notion*†: And thus again I can prove, that *persevero* is *to exhort*; for is not *persevero* exactly the same as *exhorter*? and is not *exhorter* to exhort? or that *Manere* is *to persevere*; for is not *Manere* exactly the same with *persisto*? and is not *persisto*, to *persevere*? So that for ought I can see, it must be allow'd, either that all words may be us'd even as we please,

* Epistola in fine Malal. p. 39.

† Dissert. p. 73.

or

or else that προτρέπω must signifie, as it has done for above Two thousand years, *hortari*; that is, not always to *Exhort*, (a Word he makes such wretched Mirth with) but to *excite* by any other methods: unless when *Virgil* says, *Jam Vitulos hortare*; and *Ovid*, *Hortatúque Canes*, they mean, that *Dogs* and *Bullocks* are to be made tractable by good Advice and Exhortation.

If our Critic is unalterably determin'd, that the Sense of this Passage must be [*the Crimes which You* upbraid *me with*] why should he not chuse rather to read προτρέπεται than προτρέπεις? for tho' I no more know an Instance of προτρέπω than of προτρέπω's being us'd for *incito*, yet the Formation of the Word will more easily and naturally allow of this use: *Id quod* προτρέπεται may well enough signifie, *quæ mihi vitio vertit*; but προτρέπεις, in that sense, is, I think, a very *improper* and unnatural *Innovation in Language*.

One would wonder that Dr. *Bentley* should be so eager in imputing this Mistake to my Translation, which he is so little capable of making out: but he had a double End in it: My Explication of the Word offended him so much the more, because it spoilt an Argument that He urges, to prove the Epistles Spurious: I shall draw it up in short, but in its full force and strength, and leave it to the Consideration of the Reader. *Προτρέπω was never us'd for incito in any ancient Author before the Epistles, nor by any modern Author since the Epistles; nor in the Epistles themselves: therefore the Epistles are Spurious.* This Weighty Point is shut up with a Piece of Hi-

ſtory, that is worſe founded than his Criticiſm; and proceeds from Something which was always thought a greater Blemiſh to a Divine, than want of Judgment. He ſays, *The Edition aſcrib'd to* Cujacius, *and another of* Aldus, *tho' the Two Principal of All, and Both of 'em in the Publick Library at* Oxon, *had yet the Odd Fortune to lye all the while conceal'd from our Late Editors that liv'd there* (*a*). I am at a Loſs how to deal with a man of this Extraordinary Confidence, that can ſo boldly aſſert what 'tis impoſſible he ſhould know. What ſhall I ſay to One, who will face me down, that I never ſaw, what I know my ſelf to have often ſeen and us'd? nay, and will prove this to me out of my own Preface? the place he quotes is this, *Codices Impreſſos quatuor præ manibus habui qui eodem plane Textu ſtuntur; apud quos Verſiones ſunt duæ, altera à* Naogorgo, *altera in* Uſum Schol. Soc. Jeſ. *edita* (*b*). Two of the Four Books I here particularly mention'd, how does he know but thoſe he mentions are the Other Two I mean? as indeed they are. I had no occaſion to name 'em, becauſe I found little Difference in 'em from thoſe which I had in my Own Study: the Verſion aſcrib'd to *Cujacius*, is exactly the ſame with That, put out for the *Schools of the Jeſuites*, which I have expreſly ſaid I made uſe of. A man of any Candour and Fairneſs, or indeed of any Common Modeſty, would not have preſum'd, upon ſo ſlight Grounds, ſo poſitively to aſſert, that I had overlook'd what lay ſo plainly in my way: but I am the leſs ſurpriz'd to hear this from Dr. *Bentley*, who would fain perſwade me that I never ſaw my Own Edition.

(*a*) Diſſer. P. 73.

(*b*) *Vide* Præf. *p.* 3.

In

In the Body of this Dissertation there are Two other Mistakes, which the Dr. has found in my Version: I took no notice of 'em where they lay; but, to avoid Confusion, reserv'd 'em for this place. The First is, my rendring ποτήρια Θευκλέων, *poculorum Vitreorum*, as *Suidas*, *Etymologicon Magnum*, and *Favorinus* had done before me. These are Eminent Names in that Sort of Learning, which Dr. *Bentley* seems best acquainted with, and most to value himself upon; and therefore, one would think, should be able to excuse me with him: but his Maxim is, to value nothing any further than it is to his purpose. When *Suidas* is brought in for preserving some few Fragments of *Babrius* *, then he is a man that converses with *Writers of Size and Quality*: but when he is produc'd for that, *which will leave us not the least Footstep of our Corinthian Poster* (*a*), and *whereby the argument about* Phericles *would vanish into nothing* (*b*); then he is a trifling Scribler, his Lexicon consists of *Excerpta from Scholiasts and Glossaries* (*c*). If once he begins to quarrel thus with his Good Friends the Lexicographers, I can expect no mercy from him: But I would ask him, why he says that in the *particular passage before us neither the Use of Language nor Good Sense will allow* Θευκλέα ποτήρια to be translated *Glasses*? When *Phalaris* is said to send *Cups of Gold and Silver*, and besides † *Ten Couple* Θευκλέων ποτήρια, to me it seems agreeable to *Good Sense*, that these Cups, which are here distinguish'd from Cups of Gold and

* Differt. p. 140.

(*a*) Ibid. p. 27.

(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) Ibid.

† Ἀνίσχαλα δύο, καὶ ζεύγη ἀπίθων δύο, καὶ χρυσᾶ πώματα, καὶ κεραμέας ἀργυρᾶς ἢ ἐκ τοῦ ἡμᾶς τίχνης δύο, καὶ ποτήρια Θευκλέων ζεύγη δέκα. Ep. 70.

Silver, should not be as Dr. *Bentley* conceives, *Silver at least; if not of a more precious Metal:* unless there be some other Metal, besides Gold, more precious than Silver. He may be as Merry upon these Glasses as he pleases, and call 'em *Odd and Stingy Presents, Cheap and Brittle Compliments*; I am not answerable for *Phalaris*'s Generosity. Besides I freely own my self Ignorant how cheap Glasses were in *Sicily* two thousand Years ago; for ought I know, they might be Great Rarities, and fit to bear the Rest of his Presents Company; especially being of so Vast a Size as they appear to have been, and sent in so much greater Number than the Other Presents were: for the Epistle tells us there were but *Two* Cups of Silver, and *Four* of Gold; and *Ten Couple* of those of *Thericles*. From whence one would be apt to conclude, that they were of a *Baser*, and *not of a more Precious Metal than Silver and Gold*, as the Dr. imagines. I can hear all his Raillery upon *Phalaris* here for a *Stingy* Present: but why is he offended with Me too for a *Present* I never design'd him? He says I have presented him with an Emendation of *Poculorum Vitreorum*, whereas the former Interpreters honestly translat'd it, *Thericlean Cups*. But I must put the Dr. in mind to quote those *Honest Translators* honestly: he knows One of the Two translates it *Poculorum Vitreorum*, as I do; I mean *Cujacius* (or whoever else be the Author of that Version ascrib'd to him) whom the Dr. is pleas'd to say, I never saw.

With the same Sincerity he tells me, that whereas I have render'd *ανθ' ἁλὸς, in marin*

arundinis (a); the Translation in the former Editions was, *instar pinus* (b). Here again I have follow'd the Version, which he advises me to consult in my next Edition (c), the Version of *Cujacius*, which has it, *in morem arundinis*: and this I did, because I thought it would be a greater piece of justice to my Author, to make the Passage in him Clear and Intelligible, than to translate a Greek Proverb Literally, which would have been no Proverb in Latin. Dr. *Bentley* would probably have Interpreted it Literally, on purpose to have had an occasion of explaining it; I could have done so too, and have cramm'd a Page of *Erasmus* into my Notes, as He has here into his Dissertation: but I am glad I translated it as I did; for 'tis pity the Dr. should have wanted an Opportunity of shewing how excessively Witty he could be upon this Proverb. *Ἐκριζῶ αὐτὰς ὥσπερ πίτυν*, says *Phalaris*, *I will extirpate them like a Pine-Tree*; and this Tree (according to the Dr's Natural History) *perishes by Lopping*. He takes this Hint to tell me, that I have *lopp'd off a Branch of his Evidence* (a), that I have *executed this Proverb upon it self, and extirpated the Pine-Tree out of my New Version* (a); that I have *rooted up the Pine-Tree, and transplanted Reeds* (a) thither: which he *confesses is above his Small Understanding in Gardening* (a). What a Deluge of Wit is here! all these fine things are said within the Compass of half a Page: who can resist a Writer, that thus takes care, that his Fancy shall still keep pace with his Judgment; and that the One shall not Instruct You more than the Other Entertains

(a) Ep. 92.
(b) Differ. p. 29.
(c) Ibid. p. 75.
(a) P. 29, 30.

You? However, after he has refreſh'd himſelf a little, he muſt give me leave to tell him, that his *Underſtanding in Gardening*, is indeed very *Small* (as ſmall as his Knowledge in Natural Hiſtory) if he thinks that it has any thing to do either with *Reeds* or *Pines*; which, I take it, grow as rarely in Gardens as *Muſhrooms* ariſe out of *Rotten Paſſages in Authors*. Dr. *Bentley* muſt indeed be allow'd to underſtand Some parts of Gardening very well; particularly *Tranſplanting* and *Weeding*: The Firſt of theſe he has prov'd his Skill in by thoſe Few Notions that are worth any thing in his Piece; for they are *tranſplanted* from Other Mens Prefaces, the Nurſeries of all his Critical Learning: His Skill in the Second is made out by all the Reſt of his Appendix, which is nothing elſe but a Collection of Ill *Weeds*, pull'd up out of Good Writers. There is, I remember, a Paſſage in *Athenæus*, where this Happy Talent of *Weeding Authors* is very well expreſs'd: I ſhall give it the Learned Reader, together with three or four Lines that introduce it; becauſe it is, all together, one of the Shorteſt and Liveliеſt Accounts I have met with of a Man poſſeſs'd with the Spirit of Criticiſm. Οὐδὲν ἄλλο σὺ ἔοικας, ſays *Cynulcus* to *Ulpian*, ὦ λόγους ἀνεξετάστους ἐρανίζων, ἐκ ἰατρίνης μαθόντα, ἢ τῆς ἐν λόγοις χάρτης ἀποξαίνειν τοῦτο: ἀλλὰ χόρτον ἀποτίλλοντι ὅμοιος εἶ παῦλα καταγίνας ζητῶν, κεῖ, ὁ κεῖ (*); ἐρῶ, ἐκ ἐρῶ; of *Athenæus*, at the very entrance, tells us, this *Ulpian* was ſuch an inſufferable Pedant, that he would neither Eat nor Drink any thing, till he had aſk'd the Queſtions κεῖ, ὁ κεῖ? and ſatisfied himſelf in what Greek Author the Word, by which it was call'd, was to be found; from whence, he ſays, he got the Name of Κεϊνιάστης: which I deſire Dr. *Bentley* may be added to *Chlonibachonithlus*, as a Like Inſtance of the Name of a man but *once* mention'd in old Authors.

(*) The Epitomizer

Ἐρευ-

ἐξαναγκάζοντι τὴν πόλιν τὸν προσήκοντα τοῖς σωφρονεστέροις, τὸν ἀνδρῶδες σωφρονεῖν,

Θαυμάσιε Ἐχεκρατίδη, καὶ ἀνὰ τρηχεῖαν Ὄνειον ἀνιόντες, Ἀθήνιον τὴν ἀδίκως ἀδικουμένην σωφρονίζων

Lib. 3, *Ch.* 17. A Character, which will fit the *Tyrians* of Our Time, as well as thoſe of *Athenæus*'s; for the Race of 'em is not yet extinguiſh'd.

I have follow'd our Diſſertator thro' a long Scene of Impertinence; and am come at laſt to That Part, where he places his greateſt Strength; that is indeed, the moſt Trivial Part of all, the MSS. I told the Reader in my Preface, that I only made uſe of ſuch different Readings in the MSS, as conduc'd to the better underſtanding the Text; for I always thought it a Ridiculous piece of Pedantry to load a book with Various Lections to no purpoſe: but this I find Dr. *Bentley* calls *Skill in uſing MSS.* He and I differ in our Notions about theſe matters; and I hope we always ſhall.

In the 64th Epiſtle, the Printed Copies read ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐδυσώπησεν ἂν φύσιν πάντως ἀνθρώπου: I ſaw the MSS here had a Various Reading ἐμὲ for ἂν, which I paſs'd over with that Contempt it deſerv'd, and gueſs'd it ſhould be ἐκτύπησεν; a Reading, that with a very ſmall Alteration made my Author ſpeak Senſe: Let us ſee, what Dr. *Bentley*, and his MSS make of it. *Phalaris* ſays, τοῦτο δὲ τοῖς ἀναγκαιοτάτοις ἐμοῖς· ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐδυσώπησεν ἂν φύσιν πάντως ἀνθρώπου: πίστιν δὲ ὅτι σφ' ἄλλους τοῦτο, ὅτι καὶ φίλοις βαρὺς ἦν. Which I would render thus, *I am not ſo much as ſeen by my Neareſt Relations*; *and I*

now

now the more carefully would mankind, becauſe I have found no Faith nor Truſt, not only among Other Perſons, but even among my Friends themſelves. Dr. *Bentley* ſays, we muſt take ἀλλ' here for a *certain Correction*. But ſince the Tyrant is giving a reaſon for his *preſent* Recluſe way of Living in oppoſition to his *former* freedom and openneſs, methinks ἀλλ' can't well be ſpar'd here. Beſides [*I avoid all mankind leſs than I ought to do*] ſeems to Me a very improper expreſſion; eſpecially after a Man has ſaid, that he avoided all mankind to ſuch a Degree as *not to be ſeen by his Neareſt Relations*, would he add immediately, that he avoided Company leſs than he ought to do? What would Dr. *Bentley* have him do more? or how can a Man be more retir'd than by ſeeing no body? I deſire the Dr. to have Some Regard to Senſe, as well as to MSS.

This ὑπάκουον returns again in the 68th Epiſtle, ἁμωνὶ ὑπάκουον ἐγράφω ἵνα χρείαν σοῦ λάβω ὑπηρετῶν. *Now here too*, he ſays, *Every one of the MSS have in* ἀλλ'. As for the King's MS, no body knows what it has, or has not; and this Epiſtle is wanting in one of the *Bodly* MSS: ſo that all theſe MSS that I have overlook'd prove at laſt to be but One; in which perhaps I might not obſerve this Various Reading. But if I had obſerv'd it, I think I ſhould ſcarce have made uſe of it; for if we put ἀλλ' in the room of ὅτι, ὑπάκουον muſt be an Adverb, and referr'd to ὑπηρετῶν: and the Rules of good Language will hardly allow, that the Adverb ſhould be joyn'd in Place to

one

one Verb, and in Senſe to another, at ſuch a diſtance: not to inſiſt on the Ambiguity that ariſes from its Neighborhood to ἐμαυτὸν, to which it ſeems to be naturally joyn'd as an Adjective; and 'tis with ſome difficulty, that we bring our ſelves to underſtand it otherwiſe, even after the Correction of οὐδὲν into οὐ δὲ is allow'd to prevail. Had the Author intended ἐνδεέστερον for an Adverb, he would probably have put it after ἐμέθεν, and not before it. I am ſo us'd to Dr. *Bentley*'s Language, that I can eaſily bear his telling me here, that *I make mere Nonſenſe of the Context*: whether I do or no, muſt be left to thoſe who will take the trouble of conſidering it. Indeed ſuch a fair and ingenuous Tranſlator as Dr. *Bentley*, that renders ἢ οὐδὲ τὰ πατρὸς αὐτάρκως, *than I want Money to give*, may make Nonſenſe of any thing.

There is yet one Inſtance more of Unskilfulneſs that he charges upon me, διατείνων ἐν οἷς ἦν; I tranſlate, *perpendens ſuam Conditionem, conſidering the Circumſtances he is in*, as *Naugerius* had tranſlated it before me; the Dr. renders it, *perſiſtens in propoſito, proceeding in his preſent ways*, according to *Cujacius*: neither of us produce any Inſtances of our Uſe of the word διατείνω, nor pretend to do it; we are meerly upon the Gueſs, what it muſt ſignifie, by its relation to the Sentence; and which of us gueſſes beſt, is to be determin'd by our Readers. Had I been never ſo much out, he might have taken a more Courtly way of letting me know it, than by ſaying, that *Lemon carries one thing, and his* Aſs *another*; that is, the Writer of the Greek Epiſtle

means

means differently from the *Ass* his Editor: This is such a Compliment as there is but one Proper Way of Returning; Gentlemen do not use to resent such Language with their Pens only. But I forgive him; 'tis a Mode of Speech familiar to him, I find, and which he bestows on every one he has to deal with. In the 11th page, the Sophist is *an Ass under the Skin of a Lyon*; in the 59th, *Phalaris* himself is *a meer Asinus ad Lyram*. Since he is so fond of *Asinine Proverbs*, I will throw him in One out of *Aristophanes*, to compleat his Collection. It is, Ὄνος λύραν ἀνέλαβε, upon which *Erasmus* has this Remarkable Gloss; *Asinus portans Mysteria, in eos dicebamus qui præter dignitatem in Munere quopiam versantur; velut si quis ignarus literarum Bibliothecæ præficeretur*: in English thus, *The Proverb of* an Ass carrying Mysteries *was apply'd to Those who were preferr'd to some Place they did not deserve, as when a Dunce was made a Library-keeper.* And if that *Library-keeper* should so far mistake his Office, as to think he was put there, not to shew Books to Gentlemen that came to see 'em, but to keep the Door shut, he would be still more unfit for the Place. I have had Worse Treatment than this from Dr. *Bentley*: for he has not only deny'd my Collator the use of the King's MS, but dealt with me all along, as if I had seen it, and us'd it my self; once before, in the case of *Ἰσθμιονῖκαι*, and here agen in relation to *Ἀκρόδρυα*. Having no Authorities to countenance my Version of *Ἀκρόδρυα* by *expendent*, I laid hold of a different Reading in the King's MS. sent me by my Collator, where he assur'd me it was *Ἀκρόνυα*:

Dr.

Dr. *Bentley* puts on his Critical Spectacles, and finds, that tho' it be διὰ πᾶν now, it was originally διατεῖνον; and that the ι has been *eras'd* by a modern hand, *as appears by a Void Space*: and upon this he triumphs over my Skill in peruſing the MS, when he knows it was fifty Miles off of me, all the Time of the Edition. What *Void Spaces* now *appear* in that MS, how many *Eraſings* there are, or by what *Hand*, it matters not much to diſpute or enquire. I own I overlook'd the *falſe accenting* of theſe words, which he charges me with: but to ſet down my tranſlation of διὰ πᾶν, οὐ ϛα, and at the ſame time to ſay, I make it an *Interrogative*, is according to Dr. *Bentley*'s way of repreſenting things: he ſhould either have been leſs ſevere with Me (*a*) on the account of My miſtakes of this kind, or have taken more care to prevent his Own; Some of which, ſince he condeſcends to theſe Trifles, I ſhall ſo far comply with him, as to give the Reader an account of.

(*a*) Nos *Phalarin* Grammaticum habemus, qui perperàm ſcripta etiam capite punit. *Cic. in Piſon.*

P. 8. πίνας δὲ for πίνας ἂν. P. 19. Ἐπιζῆς for ἐπιεζῆς. P. 18. μετ' ἀὸ for μετ' ἀὖ. P. 21. ἔστι πὼς for οἵτι. P. 35. ὡς ῥᾴϑυμος for ὡς ϑαῤῥαλέος. P. 45. Ἰάσονας for Ἴασας. P. 48. ζώα for ζωά. Ibid. ἐγκαὶ δ' for ἐγκαὶ δ'. P. 61. πίσσα for πισσᾷ. P. 70. ἀὸ for ἀὖ. P. 94. συνίχναλε δὲ for συνίχναλε δὲ. P. 119. κϛλέπτομεν for κϛλεπτόμεν. P. 138. ἥπτα μένα for ἑπτάμενον. P. 139. ἀλαδᾶς for ἀλαδᾶς. Ibid. Οὐδὲ σὲ for ἐδὲ σὲ. Ibid. ἐδὲ for ἐδὲ. Ibid. ἀμπλεῖν for ἀμπλάν. P. 146. ἔπειρον for ἐπεῖρον &c.

The

The Reader will think the Controverſy runs low when we begin thus to diſpute about Accents and Encliticks; and indeed I think ſo too; but how can I help it? My Excuſe muſt be, that I was oblig'd to engage the Dr. in what way he lik'd beſt, and had not the Choice of my Own Weapons.

And now are not Theſe, which I have gone thro', Mighty Blemiſhes to my Edition? and fit to be inſiſted on by the Dr, in order to Humble Me and *my Teachers?* He takes care to tell me, that he can produce more Inſtances of this kind; I queſtion not but he may: but if he can find out no more Conſiderable Miſtakes than theſe, I think he may leave off Criticiſing upon this Subject.

For my part, I am not much concern'd what the Men of Letters think of my Skill in Languages or Manuſcripts: but it concerns Dr. *Bentley* to conſider what the Men of Sincerity will think of his falſe and diſingenuous Dealing; what the Men of Modeſty and Humility will think of his Lofty Inſulting Language; what the Men of Good Nature and Candor will think of his Fierce and Vindictive Temper: how the Men of Taſte and Breeding will reliſh his Scurrilous Language, his Frigid Jeſts, his Low and Clownish Expreſſions; how the Men of Reaſon and Judgment will approve his Weak and Inconcluſive Ways of Arguing: It is a mighty Imputation upon Him, to have any of theſe Bad Qualities, or to want any of theſe Good ones: but it is no Great Blot upon Me, if I ſhould appear not to be exactly well skill'd in the Learned Languages.

I was

I was ſatisfied from ſome Books lately written, what a wide difference there is between a Man of Cloſe Arguing, and Rambling Learning; and how unnatural a Step it is for an *Amathuſius* to ſtart up a Profeſſor of Divinity. This indeed made me not expect much from Dr. *Bentley* in the Reaſoning Way; but when he came to Matters of Pure Criticiſm, I thought One, who had bent all his Thoughts and Reading that way, One who has now the ſole Uſe and Power of the King's Library, and had for many Years attended upon one of the Greateſt Scholars in *Europe*; One that ſet out with all theſe Advantages, I thought, might eaſily have confounded a Young Writer, that never aim'd at being a Critic in the Greek Tongue, or made the Niceties of it his peculiar Study and Buſineſs. But, to conſult the ſeveral Editions, to collate the Manuſcripts, to turn over Dictionaries, nay, and to make 'em; and all this ado, only to find a falſe Accent, and an Eſcape in penning a Manuſcript (which I have ſhewn to be the utmoſt of the Dr's Atchievement on this Article) ſeems to Me to favour too much of the Character of thoſe men, who, as he himſelf makes the Obſervation, without conſidering whom it hits, love to make a Noiſe about Trifles; or (not to wrong him of his Own more Elevated Expreſſion) *to make a Tide and a Flood in a Baſin of Water.*

Nothing has done Learning more diſſervice among the Senſible part of Mankind, than that indiſcreet Value, which Men of Letters oftentimes put upon the moſt trifling parts of Knowledge; that *[illegible]* in the way

of

of Scholarship, of which *Theophrastus* has given us a Character, as it relates to Human Life and Affairs 'Tis this that has brought so ill a Report upon Criticks and Criticism, and sunk extreamly the Value of that Sort of knowledge, which has been of such Excellent Use to the World when wisely employ'd.

A Good *Critic* is a Name that deserves Honour; for it carries in it Probity, Learning, Relish, Good Nature, and Good Sense, with a great many Other very desirable Qualities: but as the Word is now generally employ'd to signifie a Captious, Vain, Opinionative, Half-learn'd, Ill-natur'd Censurer of other Mens Labours, I must confess, I think nothing can be more despicable. Let us stop a while, e'er we take our Leave of this argument, to consider their several Characters.

A Good Critic distinguishes himself always by the Choice of his Subject; it is some Point of Importance, and worth determining: an Ill One is ever busied in things of no manner of Use nor Consequence; and yet is as full of Himself, and his Performances, as if the Commonwealth could not subsist without 'em.

A Good Critic is Modest and Decent in his Censures; Candid, and Impartial; he treads warily, uses his Judgment much, but distrusts it more: speaks with Respect of those he differs from; never takes a pleasure in insulting over their Mistakes, or lessening their Reputations. *Isaac Casaubon*, *Gerard Vossius*, and *Grotius*, were all men of this Cast; and so was *Menage* too, till *Baillet*, towards the latter End of his Life, provok'd him. The Cha-

racter

racter which our Excellent *Pearson* * gives of him, is very remarkable, and fit to be consider'd by Dr. *Bentley* before he appears agen in the way of Criticism, *Quanta animi moderatio! quantus Candor! nec jam Criticam cum nullius fama dispendio exercere; nullius Existimationem lædere, nullius Erroribus insultare, nusquam ex Musæo Laureolam quærere; per quos profecerit aperte profiteri; à Viris Doctissimis non, nisi salvo eorum honore, aperte dissentire; ut exclamare cogar, O Jecur vere Cruciun, sine Splene!* In which also he drew his Own, as well as *Menage*'s Character.

* *In his Letter to* Menage *before* Diogenes Laertius.

Salmasius and *Scaliger* had nothing of this in 'em, they were all Gall, and Pride, and Pedantry; which made the Vast Learning they were Masters of lit so ill upon 'em, that the World hated and despis'd 'em, at the same time that it was profiting by 'em: Mr. *Wotton* tells us, *There are some now alive whose Fame will one day equal that of the* Scaligers (or, as it is in his Last Edition, the *Salmasius*'s) *and* Grotius's *of other Nations* †. If he had put *Salmasius* into *Grotius*'s, and not into *Scaliger*'s Room, I would so far have agreed with him, that there are some now alive, who will inherit Their Fame, as to One great Part of their Character; for they have All their Ill Qualities in Perfection — with but a slight Mixture of any of their Good ones. For my part, were Dr. *Bentley* as great a Scholar, as Some say he is, or even as He thinks himself to be, yet I had rather not know the Greek Alphabet, than have his Knowledge and his Manners together: for as much

† *Reflect. upon Anc. and Mod. Learning*, p. 385.

much as I value Learning, I value Good Senſe, and Common Civility more.

A Good Critic is rich in his own Store; he has a ſure Fund of Good Judgment and True Knowledge, which he can truſt to upon all Occaſions, without needing to rifle his Neighbours: but an Ill Critic, who ſets up the Trade without a Stock to manage it, muſt be perpetually upon the Plunder: the great Employment of his *Sagacity* is, to find out Hints in Odd Corners of Books, where 'tis probable no-body elſe will look for 'em; the chief Exerciſe of his *Judging* Talent lies in diſtinguiſhing, what Borrow'd Notions he may moſt ſafely put off for his Own, and with the leaſt danger of being Diſcover'd.

A man of a ſound and well-weigh'd Judgment is afraid always of ſtanding by himſelf in a New Opinion; but a Smatterer in Criticiſm is bold, and forward; loves to maintain Paradoxes, and to defie the World. 'Tis enough to make him think a thing true or falſe, that every-body elſe has thought the contrary: for he has no way of Diſtinguiſhing himſelf, but by being Singular.

A Critic Really ſuch, always proportions his pains to the difficulty of the matter he is engag'd in, and dwells upon things more or leſs, as they want more or leſs to be dwelt on: but a Pretender is conſtantly improper and impertinent in his Learning; where the Knott of a Diſpute is, there You find him very reſerv'd and ſilent; but he lets looſe all his Criticiſms upon You in plain points, that No-body is in danger of miſunderſtanding.

So

So have I ſeen the loſt Clouds pour
Into the Seas an Uſeleſs Shower;
Whilſt the vex'd Sailors curs'd the Rain,
For which Poor Shepherds pray'd in vain.

To compleat the Character of a Critic, it is requiſite, that he ſhould write well in that Way he pretends to cenſure, and be a Good Pattern, in order to be thought a Good Judge. The Ancient Criticks were generally ſo, as *Ariſtotle*, and *Longinus*, *Tully*, and *Quintilian*: but *Some now alive* have ventur'd to Criticize upon the Performances of very fine Pens, while they themſelves had the worſt in the World; and have ſet up for Judges of Good Writing by a Taſt form'd upon the Opinions, and in a Style drawn from the Expreſſions of Modern Prefaces and Comments.

'Twere endleſs to reckon up all the Particulars that diſtinguiſh their Characters; inſtead on't, take a Reflection or two which Monſieur *St. Evremont* *, (a Fine Writer, and a Good Judge) has made on this Subject.

* Oeuvres mêlées, Troiſieme Tome, p. 28.

I have ſeen (ſays he) *of Late Years, Great Criticks in abundance, but few Good Judges. That Learned Tribe is my Averſion, who are perpetually buſie in reſtoring corrupted Paſſages, that when reſtor'd are at laſt worth nothing. They ſet the higheſt Price on ſuch Knowledge, as one would chuſe to be without, and know leaſt of thoſe things which moſt deſerve to be known. Having no fine way of thinking and ſpeaking themſelves, they can never enter into the Delicacy of another Man's Thought or Expreſſion. They would ſucceed very*

well in explaining and commenting upon a Grammarian; for His mind is thrown into much the same Mould with Theirs, and his Studies have lain the same way; but when they come to one of the Sensible and Well-bred Writers of Antiquity, they neither relish, nor understand him: his Sense and way of Thinking must needs be lock'd up to 'em, 'tis so very different from their Own. In History, they know nothing of Men, or Affairs, they turn all to Chronology; and so they be but able to tell You, what Year Such an One was Consul, they care not whether they are acquainted with his Character, or the Great Events that happen'd in his Time. Cicero *with them goes only for a Maker of* Orations, Cæsar *for a Writer of* Commentaries; *the* Consul, *and the* General *are lost to 'em. The Genius that animates their admirable Writings is not felt; the Remarkable and Instructive Passages there are not observ'd.*

I beg the Dr's Pardon for leading him into such Writers as *Bruyere*, and *St. Evremont*, who think well, and speak Justly, and quote little; I know, upon all these Accounts, they are not for his Taste: to oblige him therefore, I will throw in a Little Latin here from the *Preface* of a *Modern Critic*; and I hope it will go down with him the better for the sake of the Place where I find it. *Hic Criticum*, says my Author, *non Pædagogico Fastu tumentem, aut Farraginе quâdam Jejunæ Eruditionis omnium formare aggressus sum, sed non minus Judicio quàm Memoria suâ utentem; & qui probe calle t, quàm pauca penitus in Veterum Monumentis intelligamus, ideoq; Modestè de aliis judicet, & ab Omnibus discere sit paratus. Volo eum ante omnia niti intelligere*

gere quid Veteres velint; & ſibi diligenter cavere, ne Opinetur ſe Scire quod Neſcias *. Which Good Meaſures had Dr. *Bentley*, in his Critical Studies and Attempts, vouchſaf'd to obſerve, he had ſav'd himſelf and Me the trouble of this Public Diſpute about *Phalaris*: He had not raſhly enter'd the Liſts upon an Argument which he is by no means a Maſter of; nor begun an Indiſcreet Controverſie, without conſidering where it might End.

* Le Clerc. Præf. ad Art. Crit.

He threatens me and the World with ſome further Remarks of this kind in *Latin*: I am not, I confeſs, very apprehenſive of that; becauſe, if he had intended to write in that Tongue, it had been proper to have done it at firſt: for in that Tongue the Reflection, that has given him all this Uneaſineſs, was written; and in that Tongue therefore one would think it ſhould have been anſwer'd, and this whole Controverſie manag'd. But whatever He may do, I cannot promiſe him that No other Language will be employ'd againſt him; nor that the Enquiries of Some, whom he has affronted, will not be extended a little farther than theſe *Diſſertations*.

I was indeed in hopes, when I firſt put pen to paper, that the Diſpute would have lain purely between Us Two, and have been decided by an Appeal to the Learned Men of our Own Nation: but I find the matter is not likely to reſt here; Dr. *Bentley*'s Boaſts of his Correſpondence abroad, and of the Compliments that from thence have been paid him, have made it neceſſary to ſet Him and his Performances in as true a Light towards Foreigners, as they do or will appear in here at Home:

particularly to let Monsieur *Spanheim*, and Monsieur *Grevius* know how mistaken they have been in placing their Civilities upon One that does not deserve 'em; and can never be valu'd, but where he is not known.

If therefore I have not made use of all the Advantages against Dr. *Bentley*, which he has given me, nor display'd Him fully in all his Colours, those Defects, I hope, will soon be supply'd by a Better Hand, that intends to do right to the Subject, and to the Dr's Character, in a Tongue that will last longer, and go further: for since Dr. *Bentley* has *appeal'd* to *Foreign Universities*, to *Foreign Universities* he must *go*.

Dr.

Dr. *Bentley*'s Diſſertation UPON THE Fables of ÆSOP, EXAMIN'D.

I Had laid together ſome Short Remarks upon the Reſt of the Dr's *Appendix*, which were intended to accompany Theſe: but I ſhall be oblig'd to leave *England* before I can put 'em into Order. However, I cannot part with the Dr, till I have given him my Thoughts of his Performance on *Æſop*; and examin'd, whether he has any better Grounds for oppoſing his Judgment to Sir *William Temple*'s, in the caſe of the *Fables*, than in that of the *Epiſtles*. I cannot ſtay long enough on the Subject to do right to it; but what I ſhall be able to ſay, will, I hope, ſufficiently prove, that the Reaſonings and Diſcoveries in this latter part of his Work are perfectly of a piece with thoſe we have already had to do with; and, let him diſpute againſt *Phalaris*, or *Æſop*, or

what elſe he pleaſes, that Dr. *Bentley* will be Dr. *Bentley* ſtill.

He ſets out well — *I am glad*, ſays he, *to find a good part of the Work done ready to my hand. For Monſieur* Bachet, *Sieur de* Meziriac, *has writ the Life of Æſop in French* *. Which Life the Reader now ſuppoſes that Dr. *Bentley* has read, and found to agree exactly with his own Sentiments; but to his Surprize 'twill appear, that the Dr. has neither read it, nor ſeen it: for in the Next Line he confeſſes that he *could never meet with it*. So that he finds his Work done to his hands in a Book that he has not yet found: Books Loſt, and Books not yet come to his View, are as inſtructive to Him as any Books in his Study. There is no dealing with ſuch a Profound Scholar as this, who is as well read in what he has not ſeen, as in what he has. But perhaps here, as in Other caſes, he has his accounts at Second Hand: not ſo neither, he is purely upon the Conjecture; and *can gueſs from the great Learning of the Author known to him by his Other Works, that he has in a manner exhauſted the Subject*. That is, by his Mathematical Notes upon *Diophantus* he can *gueſs* what he ſays upon *Æſop*'s Fables. But, methinks, 'tis a little nicely gueſs'd, that *Meziriac* has *in a manner exhauſted* the Subject: why ſhould not a Man that had written ſo well upon *Diophantus*, have *quite* exhauſted it? I begin now to gueſs ſomething too, and may be able to make out my Gueſs e're I am a Month Older: I am going into a Country where *Meziriac* is, I ſuppoſe, to be had; and when I have ſeen him, perhaps I ſhall find, that Dr. *Bentley* has

* Diſſert. p. 35.

ſeen

seen him too ——— tho' he has forgotten it. For he pretends to present us here *only with such Things as have escap'd the Observation of Others*; and I now know him so well, that I suspect him a-Course whenever he sets up for Discoveries. The Business of *Ocellus* has given us One Remarkable Instance of this kind; and this small Piece we are upon will presently, even without the help of *Meziriac*, afford us Another.

The first of his *few loose Things which he fancies have escap'd the Observation of Others*, is, *that 'tis very uncertain if* (he would say *whether*) *Æsop himself left any Fables behind him in Writing*. This Hint has I believe escap'd the Observation of Others: for they that have observ'd any thing about it have observ'd the contrary. The Phrase of Antiquity is the same when they mention any thing of *Æsop*'s, as it would have been, had they thought *Æsop* really to have wrote it; the Ancients quote him just as they do Other Authors: When *Plato*, *Aristotle*, *Plutarch*, *Galen*, *Themistius*, *Gellius* cite any thing from him, 'tis ὡς ἔφη, ὡς ἔφασκε, ὡς ἔλεγε, καθ' ὃ Αἴσωπος, καθ' ὃ Αἰσώπου μῦθος, *inquit*, &c: and how would they have express'd themselves otherwise, if *Æsop*'s Writings had confessedly lain before them? Dr. *Bentley* sure will not be so Captious as to say, that these Forms of Speech are not express enough; among all Authors that quote from others, ὡς ἔφη and ὡς ἔφασκε, are Equivalent, and us'd Indifferently. Bishop *Pearson* has largely prov'd this, in his *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ* *, against *Daillé*, who laid hold of this Cavil to disparage the Epistles of *Ignatius*:

* Par. 1. p. 83.

And

And I the rather refer the Dr. to that Incomparable Work, becauſe *he confeſſes with ſome Shame, that he had either never read it, or utterly forgot it* *. A good account of his Acquaintance with One of the Firſt Books in the World, in the Way of his Profeſſion! They that read Books at this rate, will be ſure to write Books that will be ſo read. But not to forget our buſineſs — The Word ἴαμβος it ſelf is apply'd to *Æſop*, as an Author, by *Suidas*, *Aphthonius* (*a*), and others: What *Suidas* ſays deſerves a Reflection; his Words are, ἴαμβοις τὸν βίον Δελφοῖς αὐτῷ συμβάντα ἐν βιβλίοις β'. μᾶλλον δὲ τινὲς φασὶν Ἀισωπικὰ ἀναγεγράφθαι μόνον, κ. τ. λ. *he wrote Two Books of what befel him at* Delphos; *but Others are rather of Opinion that he wrote nothing but Fables* (*b*). So that tho' ſome doubted whether he wrote any account of what happen'd to him at *Delphos*, yet, according to *Suidas*, no-body doubted but that he wrote Fables. *Euſtathius* calls him expreſly not λογοποιὸς only, but μυθογράφος; expounding the one by the other †. The Words too of the Old Scholiaſt on *Ariſtophanes* are ſo full, I think, as not eaſily to be eluded; ὁ Αἴσωπος, ſays he, ἐν τοῖς μύθοις τὸ δοκοῦν λέγει (*c*). That Few ſay in Terms, he was a Writer, is becauſe No-body had any Suſpicions to the contrary: and when the Doubt was not ſtarted, nor thought of, there was no need to guard againſt it. I have produc'd ſome Ancients that ſay, he *did* write; Dr. *Bentley* does not pretend to inſtance in any that ſay, he *did not*: inſtead

* Diſſert. p. 113.

(*a*) ἄριστα πάντων συγγεγραφέναι τοὺς μύθους. Προγυμν.

(*b*) *Suidas* explains διασκευάσματα by λόγους, in that very place.

† Ad initium Iliadis A.

(*c*) Sch. in Plut. 1

ſtead of that, his beſt Arguments for this New Point are Theſe that follow.

The Old Man in Ariſtophanes (ſays he *) *learnt his Fables in Converſation*, ἐμαθεν ἐν Συμποσίῳ. In which of his Dictionaries does Συμπόσιον ſignifie *Converſation?* Or is it neceſſary, that what was learnt at a *Feaſt* muſt be learnt in *Converſation?* might it not be a part of their Feſtival Entertainments, to have ſome agreeable Book read to them? and might not *Æſop* ſometimes be that Book? If this might be the Caſe, then the Old man might learn his Fables at a Feaſt, and yet learn 'em out of a Book too. But ſuppoſe he did not, allowing that he learnt 'em in Converſation; what follows from thence? that, becauſe the Fables of *Æſop* were in every-bodys Mouth, and told at their Meals, by way of entertainment, *therefore* there was no written Collection of 'em, they were preſerv'd all by Memory. If this be Criticiſing, I am ſure, Criticiſing has nothing to do with Reaſoning. By the ſame way of Deduction will I prove, that we have not a *Written Creed* now, nor ever had one: for have not all People from the Riſe of Chriſtianity down to this Time learnt it, without the help of a Book? and is it not plain therefore that the Creed is preſerv'd by Memory only, and has never been committed to Writing?

* P. 136.

The Dr. produces a Second Paſſage in *Ariſtophanes*, where one man reproaches anothers Ignorance thus, οὐδ' Αἴσωπον πεπάτηκας, *You have not read ſo much as* Æſop; for ſo he himſelf tranſlates it: *from whence*, he ſays, *one might conclude that* Æſop *wrote his Own Fables.* If

they

they were his *Own* Fables, one might pretty safely conclude that he *wrote* 'em; for those *Writings* are the most properly a man's *Own*, which he *writes*. But Dr. *Bentley*, it seems, concludes from this very Passage, (I cannot imagine How) that Æsop did not write 'em. I'll he tells us by what Wonderful Means he got to this Conclusion, I can say nothing to it. But as for his Occasional and Weighty Debate, whether or no εἰς Αἴσωπον πυνθάνεσθαι be a Proverbial Saying *spoken of Illiterates* *, I can see no manner of reason why it was brought in here, but meerly for the pleasure of contradicting *Erasmus* and *Scaliger*: Proverb, or no Proverb, I think, it equally proves, that there were Fables at that time, which went under the Name of Æsop; and what advantage can be made of this, must be against Dr. *Bentley*.

* Dissert. p. 136.

The Closing Argument, that winds these Proofs up into a Demonstration is a Passage in *Plato*'s *Phædo*, where *Socrates* says, εἴ τε ἐχοιμι ἔτερον, ἐξ ἀπαθοῦς μύθους τοὺς Αἰσώπου, τούτων ἐποίησα ἂν οἷς πρῶτοις ἐνέτυχον: *Among the Fables of* Æsop *I had* * or, *knew at hand, and remember'd* *, *I put those into Verse to be Him, that first occurr'd to me*: from whence the Dr. shrewdly observes, *that* Socrates *does not say he made use of a Book of Fables*; and from his not saying so would have us believe that there was no such thing as a Book of Æsop's Fables in *Socrates*'s time. *Socrates* was now in Prison, and in obedience to a Divine Admonition thought himself oblig'd to do something in Poetry: he pitch'd upon Æsop, putting into Verse such of his Fables as occurr'd to him; and, if we may guess by what we have left of his

his doing, ſuch Fables occurr'd to him as were neareſt his Own Caſe. Now what need was there of having recourſe to a Written *Æſop* for that which he and every-body remember'd? or what wonder was it, that he had not the Book by him in Priſon? why, we are not ſure that at the particular point of time, when he did theſe Fables in Priſon, he had ſo much as *Pen and Ink* allow'd him.

This is the Irreſiſtible Evidence, with which Dr. *Bentley* has taken upon him to confront the Opinion of Two Thouſand Years; ſuch Evidence as one would not admit againſt *Simmias Rhodius*, to rob him of the honour of his *Egg*, or his *Hatchet*. Is it fit, that men ſhould make uſe of their little Skill in Letters, their Conjectures, their Fancies, their Dreams, to attack the Reputation of our firſt Maſters in good writing? is it grateful with ſuch groundleſs Suſpicions as theſe to fall upon the Father of Moral Fable, whoſe happy way of conveying knowledge has been ever ſpoken of with ſo much Reſpect, and been of ſuch ſtanding Uſe to Mankind? Has Dr. *Bentley* ſworn to be at defiance, with every man that writes Maſterly in his way? Sir *William Temple* may be at Eaſe, he ſees he is affronted in Good Company. Let me tell our Critic, what I have heard from Wiſe Men, that Confidence and Paradoxes are not the true way to a Laſting Reputation; that the firſt point of Modeſty and Senſe is, never to Contradict the whole World Needleſly, and the next to that, to be ſure never to do it without very good Grounds.

The

The Dr. often gives me an Occasion to put him in mind of this Truth; and more than Once in the very Passage we are upon: where he has laid hold of a Careless Expression in *Laertius* (a Writer of his Own Form) to oppose *Plato*'s Account of *Socrates*, or rather *Socrates*'s Account of himself. *Laertius*, he says, *seems to hint that* Socrates *did but* One *Fable*: and this seeming Shadow of an Hint, even from *Laertius*, is to bear down the Express Authority of *Plato*, who says he did Several *. The very Spirit of *Athenæus* is got into him, who † undertook to disprove some of the most Remarkable Particulars of *Socrates*'s Life recorded in *Xenophon* and *Plato*, by the very same *Negative* Way of Arguing, that Dr. *Bentley* makes use of against *Phalaris* and *Æsop*; the *Silence and Praetermission of Authors* (*a*): nay, and expresses himself in the same Mannerly Way too, calling *Plato*, the best-bred Man in the World, *Dog* and *Lyar*; covertly indeed, whereas Dr. *Bentley* has bestow'd much the same Titles (*b*) on those He disputes against, bluntly and openly. But the Impartial *Casaubon* takes the part of those Great Men against his Author; reproves his Rudeness, and confutes his Reasonings; and shews him to be, as Confident Clowns generally are, all over mistaken (*c*). The Men of Letters, I hope, will

* *See the Passage before quoted* p. 236.

† L. 2, c. 15.

(*a*) Differ. p. 64.

(*b*) Leucon *carries one thing, and his Ass another.* P. 74. — *something useful to a Lyar besides a pretty Invention.* — p. 17.

(*c*) *Dr.* Bently *has ventur'd to make use of these very Exploded Arguments of* Athenæus, *to discredit* Socrates's *Epistles; and ushers 'em in with this Glorious Character,* Among Other Errors in Chronology for which *Athenæus* chastises *Plato*. Diss. p. 93.

will excuse this Freedom; No man is readier than I am to value *Athenæus* for what he ought to be valu'd, the *Fragments* and *Remains* of Antiquity which he has preserv'd: but to see him insolently trampling on Great Names, is what I cannot bear without Indignation.

I need no Transition from hence to Dr. *Bentley*, who taking it now for granted, that Æsop *did not write his Own Fables*, will tell us Who wrote 'em for him. *Demetrius Phalereus* he thinks to have been *the first that committed them to Writing* *: And if Others should think that he was not the First, they would have somewhat better Ground for their Thought than He has; for they have *Aristophanes*, and his *Scholiast* (either of whose Words may be taken in this case, I hope, a little sooner than Dr. *Bentley's*) to countenance their Opinion. *Aristophanes*, in the Passage mention'd by Dr. *Bentley*, plainly intimates, that there was a Book of Æsop's Fables in *His* time; and *His* Time was before *Demetrius's*. Οὐδ' Αἴσωπον πώποτε, is, *ne Æsopum quidem legisti*: thus the Scholiast interprets it; πώποτε, ἀντὶ τοῦ ὅλως; thus the use of the word πώποτε in other Authors‖ proves it *ought* to be translated; and which is more than all, Dr. *Bentley* himself has thus render'd it, *You have not read so much as Æsop.* How could Æsop be *read* at a time, when he supposes, that there was no Collection of of Æsop's Fables *committed to writing*? It happens indeed now and then, that Books are *written* without being

* P. 138.

‖ Plato, *in his* Phædrus, *has employ'd it just in this manner*, ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ τὸν Τισίαν αὐτὸν πώποτε ἀκηβῶς: p. 273. *i. e.* Tisiam ipsum accuratè trivisti, perlegisti. Serranus *has mistaken the Sense of it, and translated it* Graviter pessum dedisti.

being *Read* (Some of Dr. *Bentley's* Works will be a Proof of this) but it can never happen I preſume, that any Book ſhould be *read*, without being *written*. The ſame Scholiaſt quotes * another Paſſage out of *Ariſtophanes's* Εἰρήνη, tho' upon a Curſory View of that Play I do not now find it there. The Poet is ſpeaking of the *Eagle*, which Bird, he ſays,

* in Σφηκας, p. 134.

Ἐκ τοίνυν Αἰσώπου λόγους ἐκνοῦται
Μόνος πτερωτὸς ὢν καὶ φιλοψευδής.

The Fable he refers to is that of *the Eagle and the Scarabeus*, which is in the preſent Collection; and I think he manifeſtly quotes a Collection of Fables extant in His Time: I'm ſure, had he intended to quote ſuch a Collection, he could not have us'd Words that would more plainly have expreſs'd his Meaning. To return to my point therefore, if there was a *Written Æſop* in *Ariſtophanes's* time, then *Demetrius Phalereus* could not be *the Firſt who committed Æſop's Fables to Writing*.

All the mention we have of this Performance of *Demetrius* is in *Laertius*, who ſays it was call'd Αἰσώπεια, and Αἰσωπείων λόγων συναγωγή; by which it ſeems to Dr. *Bentley*, that *they were in Proſe*; and if it ſhould *ſeem* to anybody elſe, that they were in Verſe, they have juſt as much Reaſon for their Fancy, as he has: unleſs by his Divining Faculty, he can from the *Title's* being in Proſe, ſmell out that the *Work* was ſo. *Some*, he ſays, *may imagine, that they are the Same that are now extant*: Some! who? not *Mezirius*, I hope, becauſe he has not ſeen him. But whoever theſe *Some* be,

Dr.

Dr. *Bentley* is against 'em. *I wish* (says he) *they were* [the same that are now extant] *for then they would be well writ with some Genius and Spirit* (a). How are we to take him? Would *Demetrius*'s Fables have been better than they were, if they had been still extant? or would the Fables that are extant, and by some ascrib'd to *Demetrius*, be better than they are, if *Demetrius* had wrote 'em? Had Dr. *Bentley* wish'd that *Demetrius*'s Fables were still extant, it had been a Kind Wish, because *Demetrius* is thought a better Writer than He that compos'd these Fables: but to wish *Demetrius*'s *the same that are now extant*, is to wish his Fables no better written, nor with more *Genius* or *Spirit*, than those we have.

(a) Differ. p. 138.

Whom have we now after *Demetrius*? why, *Some-body*, that wrote the Μῦθοι, and might, for ought any-body knows, be *before* him. For *Suidas*, the only Man the Dr. finds that mentions these Μῦθοι, giving no Intimation of the Author's Age, we are utterly at a loss where to fix him; unless Dr. *Bentley* can help us out here, and by looking into his Mouth tell us of what Age his Greek is. Probably he was of no One Age; the Μῦθοι or Μυθικὰ in Verse, like our Present Collection in Prose, were, 'tis natural to think, made up from several Authors that wrote in several Times; amongst which *Babrius* himself (the next Author he mentions) might have but a Share tho' a very large one (b): for we find him often quoted together with, and as it were under the Common Title of μῦθοι or μυθικὰ (c); and

(b) Βαβρίας Νέος, says *Suidas*.

(c) Βαβρίου μῦθοι ἤτοι μυθικά. *Suidas* in Χαρίλαος. Βάβριος ἐν τοῖς μυθικοῖς· *Suidas* in κνυδάλη. Βαβρίας μῦθοι ἤτοι μυθικὰ μέτρα· *Suid.* in Βαβρίας· Βάβριος ἐν Μυθικοῖς· *Suid.* in Νέμεσις·

by the bye, not to *Scazons* only, but *Hexameters* too (†); which, if it were a Mistake of *Suidas*, might probably arise from his finding him mix'd with the Other Writers of the *Μυθικὰ*: but I am very unwilling to think it a Mistake, because the Verses are fine ones, and worthy of *Babrius*. Whether this Guess of mine be right or no, 'tis somewhat better founded than the Dr's, who judges these *μυθικὰ* to have been written all in *Elegiac* Verse, *because* he finds under this Title Two Pentameters quoted; and besides, in Three different Places, Three Hexameters, which might have no Pentameters after them; and (to strengthen his Inference yet farther) another Instance of Two Hexameters together. This the Reader will find to be a true State of the Case, if he will take the trouble of consulting the Paragraph, where this New Thought is in as New a Manner surprizingly well handl'd.

I had like here to have overlook'd One Considerable Branch of the Dr's Discovery, where he informs us, that these Fragments of the *Mythica belong to the Æsopic Fables, which*, he says, *have not yet been observ'd that he knows of* (a). I believe no-body ever read these Fragments, but observ'd it; however they kept their Observation to themselves, because they knew no-body could read 'em without observing it. For to what else could Fragments of Fables written after the manner of *Æsop*

(a) Differ. p. 139.

(†) Οἱονεὶ μετ' ἀλλήλους ἑπομένως μὲν δεῖν,
Οἱ μυθικὰ ζῴοντες· ἃ μὲν γὰρ τοῦτο ἐξήνεγκεν
Ἑτέρωσε, ὃς ἦν δήμευσιν ἐν ἀγορᾷ τεθρίπτ' ἀνέβαν.
Suid. in ἐτεροίως.

Æsop belong, but to the *Æsopic* Fables? which Title is known to comprehend not only the Fables suppos'd to have been written by *Æsop* himself; but all Others, fram'd after his Model.

The Reader remembers, that *after Demetrius* came *Some-body*, who might as well, for any thing we know of his Time, have come *before* him. Now after this *Some-body* comes *One Babrius* *, who has the Advantage indeed of our Last Author in having a Name, and no otherwise: for his Time is equally a Secret to us. *Avienus*, 'tis true, by the Order he has plac'd him in, seems to think he was before *Phædrus*; but how little, or how long before, no-body can determin. So that this *Babrius*, that liv'd we don't know When, comes after an Author we don't know Who, and equally living we don't know When.

* Dissert. p. 140.

The Chronology of *Babrius* being thus settl'd, the Dr. proceeds to his Character; and says, he was *a Writer of Size and Quality*: I agree with him in his Meaning, tho' his Wording of it be a little Particular. *Babrius* was indeed, as far as we can guess by the Small Remains we have of him, a very valuable Author, and deserv'd to have liv'd as well as *Phædrus* himself: He has not been lost so long as *Phædrus* was; may he be recover'd as entire! His Draughts are all Natural, his Expression Lively, and his Turn of Verse Numerous and Proper. But the Dr. has by no means done right to his Character in the Instances he has given us to judge him by; which are cited imperfectly Both, and the Last of

'em extreamly to his diſadvantage. The Firſt, about the *Sick Lyon*, which the Dr. has thus quoted,

——— δεῖά τις νόσος
Κάμοντ' ἐβίβλητ', ἐκ δ' ἀνθῶν ἀδμώνων.

he may pleaſe thus to ſupply,

Οἷκος ἦν ἀπλυγῆς (*) δεῖά τις νόσος
Κάμοντ' ἐβίβλητ' &c.

To the next, φρίξας ἡ χαίτα ἔκθορε φωλάδος εἰλαί, He may add theſe Two Beautiful Verſes.

Κοιμωμένου Λέοντος, ἀχλὺς χαίτης
Διέδυσε (†) μῦς· ὁ δὲ Λέων ἐθυμώθη·
φρίξας δὲ χαίτα &c.

Suid. in φρίξ ὑπερῳᾶ.

and this (to his Eternal Scandal be it ſpoken) is a Plain Proof that he has not read over all *Suidas*. Nay, I have reaſon to ſuſpect, that he is got no further than Κάννα, which I obſerve here to be the utmoſt Line of his Citations. I would not have the Reader ſlight this Diſcovery of mine, for 'tis as conſiderable as any of Dr. *Bentley*'s, that are purely his own.

To oblige Our Critic, who is ſo fond of New Hints, I will ſuggeſt One to him, that he

(*) Suidas *in* ἀπλυγῆς, *where* τοιοῦτον ἐν, *I ſuppoſe, a Corruption of* οἶκος ἦν.

(†) *The ſtrict Meaſure of the Verſe requires that it ſhould be* διέδυσεμεν. *But the Diminſhing is more Lively, according to the Preſent Numbers.*

he may, if he pleases, improve at his Leisure. In the *Scholia* on *Thucydides* (*p.* 266.) there is a Passage quoted, ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Αἰσώπου μύθων; and the words of it are,

——ἄλλος ἄλλον ἐχθρὸν εἶναι βίλων
Τρέχει τις, ἄλλος ἄλλον ἐκ κακοῦ σῴζων.

Now here's a New Author for Dr. *Bentley*, one that writ Fables alternately in Scazons and Iambicks; or here's a Proof at least that *Babrius* (whose Verses these seem to be) did not write All his Fables in Scazons unmix'd: which may also be further confirm'd from this passage in *Suidas* *, quoted by him out of *Babrius*, ἐκ ἀνθρώπου ἔδοξεν εἶ) ἀλλὰ δαίμονες πλαμυδοί ἦσαν; for it runs naturally into these Verses,

——ἐκ ἔδοξεν ἀνθρωπεῖ
Εἶν', ἀλλὰ δαίμονες πλαμυδοί ἦσαν.

* in πλαμυδοί

I suggest this Thought to the Dr. to enrich his Dissertation with, when he puts it into Latin. After he has done so, Some-body perhaps may shew him, that 'tis founded on a Mistaken Reading of those two Passages; but till then, I shall leave 'em as I found 'em.

After these Light Skirmishes, Dr. *Bentley* comes at last to his Main Point, pretty early, I thank him; for he is not yet got quite Half way in his Remarks (that should be) upon *Æsop*. He now draws all his Forces against the Present Sett; and his arguments, I find, (making allowance for a few Straglers, which I shall fetch into their Ranks) march in this Order. First he attempts to prove That

Parcel of the Preſent Sett which *Nevelet* put out, to be younger than *Æſop* (a); in the next place, that it is even *recenter than Babrius* (b): and laſtly, that the Other Parcel of 'em, which he aſcribes to *Planudes*, is yet Younger than *Nevelet*'s (c).

(a) § VI.
(b) § VII.
(c) § VIII.

Upon the Firſt Article he performs very notably; he is to detect the whole CXXXVI to be Spurious: Now would I willingly Compound for the Odd XXXVI (if our Critic will give me leave to call an Even Number ſo); but How Many do You think he has diſprov'd? No leſs than *One*! and here endeth this Argument.

Not being able to proceed any farther here, he draws back, and falls once again upon his Firſt Preliminary, that *Æſop wrote no Fables*; which, having now waded deep in the Controverſie, he clearly perceives, becauſe the CXCIII[d] is told by *Ariſtotle* differently from what it is in *Æſop*, and in *Lucian* differently from what it is in *Ariſtotle*. Now here's a Long Chain of deſperate Conſequences; for if Dr. *Bentley* has prov'd any thing, he has prov'd Ten times more than he is aware of. If *Æſop* did not write this Fable, becauſe *Ariſtotle* gives different Circumſtances of it; then neither did *Ariſtotle* write it, becauſe *Lucian*'s Account of it is as different from His, as His is from *Æſop*'s. Nay, according to Dr. *Bentley*, neither has *Lucian* told this Fable, tho' we find it in his Works; becauſe it is otherwiſe told in our preſent Sett, which the Dr. ſuppoſes written by a Man more Modern than He. All that can be gather'd from the Little Varieties in the ſame Fable is, that they who had

had occaſion to tell it, went no further than their Memory for it, where the Main of the Fable, and as much as was for their Purpoſe, lay. And as for the Nice Circumſtances of it, they either miſtook 'em by accident, or thought they could vary 'em for the better.

This Digreſſion has kindly ſupply'd the Room of his Firſt Attempt; in the Next, he endeavours at ſomething that is really to his Purpoſe; and if his Proof were *Full*, and were his *Own*, I for my part ſhould thank him for the Diſcovery: but as it is neither, I ſhall take the liberty to ſhew both That and Him in their Proper Colours, and to do Juſtice to the Dead whom he has pillag'd.

His Pretence, and his Words are, that *the Author of the Parcel which was publiſh'd by* Neveletus *did nothing elſe but Epitomize* Babrius, *and put him into Proſe* (*a*). Granting he didn't, whom are we to thank for this thought? Dr. *Bentley* ſays, Himſelf; for He *diſcover'd it* (*b*). But there's an Honeſt Editor of the Dr's Acquaintance, a Man of a Fair Character, and who has not yet been convicted of any Trick, that puts in for the Diſcovery: let us hear what he ſays, and what the Dr. can anſwer to it.

(*a*) Diſſer. p. 143.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 142.

Nevelet. *A Diſcovery*, at this time of Day! why, I found it out *Fourſcore* Years ago, and publiſh'd it to all the World in my Edition of *Æſop*.

Dr. *Bentley*. What care I for Your Edition? I found it out my ſelf.

Nev. Not care for my Edition? You constantly referr to't, and make use on't, and quote my Preface (*a*): don't all your Dispute turn upon *Nevelet*'s Parcel? how can You pretend Ignorance?

(*a*) P. 141.

Bent. I pretend to publish *such Things only as have escap'd the Observation of Others*; I have done so, and I'll stand to't.

Nev. Stand to what You will, 'tis My Observation, and I'll *unmask* You. Have not I said, after quoting a Scazon out of the Prose-Fables, *Redolent hæc ut plurima alia harum Fabularum Versus Iambicos: atq; utinam exstarent hi Versus unde hæc desumpta sunt*; Babriam *ipsum, quantum video, Integrum haberemus, cujus jam Umbram tantùm & Epitomen habemus* (*b*). What have You said more than this comes to?

(*b*) Not. in Fab. 175

Bent. Yes, I don't call 'em, as You do, barely *Iambicks*, I call 'em *Choliambicks*, and *Scazons*: besides, You speak doubtfully, *redolent hæc, ut plurima alia, Versus Iambicos*; but I speak positively, My Expressions are, *There are most Visible Footsteps, This is a manifest turning out of Choliambicks; Who doesn't discover here a Scazon?*

Nev. You have indeed a Peculiar Way of Speaking; but what else have You added to my Discovery, besides Confidence? You endeavour what You can to disguise what You take from me; but after all, there appears upon You here and there *not only a Sameness of Sense, but a Sameness of Words too, which could not fall out by Accident* *: and this is Your Own Way of tracing a Plagiary. The most

* Dissert. p. 36.

Re-

Remarkable Hint of mine, *Cujus jam EPITOMEN habemus*, don't you tranſlate it literally, and ſay, that the Author of that Parcel did nothing but *EPITOMIZE Babrius?*

Bent. I don't go upon Hints; I have demonſtrated, 'tis my Thought, by ſhewing the very manner in which I found it out. *I diſcover'd it by this means; I obſerv'd in 'em ſeveral Paſſages, that were not of a Piece with the reſt, but had a Turn and Compoſition plainly Poetical, as in the* CCLXIII^d *Fable, which begins thus,* Ὅτε πατέζας σκλοπα χωλὸς ἐσίνετο. *This I ſaw was a Choliambic Verſe* (*a*). (*a*) Differ. p. 143.

Nev. I know where you ſaw it; 'twas in my Notes upon this Fable, where I have theſe Words, Ὅτε πατέζας σκλοπα &c. *Verſus Iambicus Scazon* ——

Bent. But I improve upon this, and ſay — *I preſently ſuſpected that the Writer had taken this out of* Babrius.

Nev. That's the very Tranſlation of my Words, that follow, — *Quales* Babrias *ſcripſit, nec ſatis ſcio num* Babriæ *ipſius.* Now, ſuppoſe You had obſerv'd ſeveral Footſteps of Scazons in the Fables, is it credible that You ſhould take Your Firſt Hint from that very Fable I did, which comes ſo Late in the Book (*b*); when the ſame Hint might as well have been taken from ſeveral Fables before it? Come, come, Dr. this bears hard upon You; the Footſteps of *Babrius* are not near ſo plain in the Fables, as the Footſteps of my Notes are in Your Remarks. (*b*) Fab. CCLXIII.

Bent.

Bent. I tread in No man's Footſteps; 'tis well known, I have declar'd loudly againſt *Filching*; *do you think I'd turn Filcher* my Self? *Foreign Profeſſors* know me better.

New. Vizzanius, and I know You better than They do; and the World in a little time ſhall know You as well as We do. You thought You might ſafely injure the Dead; but the Living ſhall do us Right upon You, ſtrip You of all Your borrow'd Plumes, and return 'em to their ſeveral Owners: You may read Your Fate out of theſe Verſes of *Virgil*.

His Bentlejus *ovat Spoliis, gaudétq; potitus.*
Neſcia Mens hominum Fati, Sortiſq; futuræ;
Et ſervare modum rebus ſublata ſecundis!
Illi tempus erit, magno cùm optaverit emptum
Intactum Neveletum, *& cùm Spolia iſta, diémq;*
Oderit ———

The Caſe between *Nevelet* and Dr. *Bentley* is fairly repreſented in this Dialogue; and if any-body ſtill thinks that the Dr. ſtruck out this Hint purely by his Own *Sagacity*, I'm ſure I ſhall take no further Pains to convince him; but go on to examine, how far the Diſcovery reaches.

Dr. *Bentley* has inſtanc'd in *Six* Several Fables, in which he finds the Traces of *Babrius*'s Scazons. In the *Two* Firſt he has pretty good Colour for what he ſays; becauſe *Suidas* has preſerv'd Three Scazons of *Babrius*, the Words of which are moſt of 'em to be found in theſe Two Fables, and very near in the ſame

ſame Order. In the *Four* next he does not go upon ſo good Grounds; but indulges his Fancy, without having the Authority of *Suidas* to back him in it. He finds out ſome Words, that will run into Scazons, or Pieces of Scazons; and, without any more ado, concludes from thence, that Theſe were deſign'd for Scazons, and thoſe Scazons were *Babrius*'s. That the Two firſt of the Four have ſomething of a Poetical Turn I agree with him; particularly the Concluſion of the Second, methinks, is Noble, and not unbecoming *Babrius*.

— φεῦγε, λύχνε, μὴ σβῆναι·
Τῶν δειλῶν τὸ φύγος ἔσται· ἀλκὴ γὰρ ἐκείνου.

The Reſt are ſo Flat, and ſo Unmuſical, that I can ſcarce ever think 'em deſign'd for Verſes; or if they were, yet I have too great a Regard for *Babrius*, to think 'em His. Others beſide *Babrius* might happen to turn a Fable the ſame way; Dr. *Bentley* ought to know, that *Callimachus* did ſo. As for One of 'em, the CLXV^th^, Dr. *Bentley* very unluckily pitches upon it, to prove it tranſpros'd from *Babrius*. It begins in the Proſe, Ἀνὴρ μετοπλὸς δύο ἐρωμένας εἶχεν, ὧν ἡ μὲν μία παῖς, ἡ δ' ἄλλη ὀφθαλμίς, which the Dr. ſuppoſes to have been in *Babrius*, thus,

Ἀνὴρ μετοπλὸς δύ' ἐρωμένας εἶχεν,
Ὧν ἡ μὲν ἦν παῖς, ἡ δὲ ὀφθαλμίς·

A Good Judge of theſe things eaſily perceives, that the Firſt of theſe Verſes has nothing Harmonious in the Numbers, or Poetical in the Ex-

Expression of it; and would conclude therefore that this Fable was not taken from *Babrius*'s Scazons, tho' he had no other Evidence of it. But it happens, that Two Verses, truly *Babrius*'s, and relating to this Fable, are preserv'd in *Suidas*, which utterly overthrow Dr. *Bentley*'s Criticism; for the Wording of 'em does not in the least fall in with That of the Prose. The Verses are,

(a) Τὸν τὸ πρῶτον ὑμνοῦσ' ἡ μὲν ἀηδὼν
Ἔτμησεν δὲ χελιδὼν λευκαυχένιος (b).

(a) *Suid.* in ἀηδών. (b) *This Last is a Corrupt Reading.*

If the Prose Fable had trac'd *Babrius* so nearly in the beginning, it would have carried some Resemblance to him throughout: and therefore in *One* of his *Six* Dr. *Bentley* is Evidently mistaken; and must guess again, before he can make up his Number.

In the mean time I desire the Reader to take notice, that there are in *Suidas* Fragments of *Babrius* belonging to above *Twenty* Several Fables; and out of all these Dr. *Bentley* has been able to produce but Two that have the least Agreement with our Prose Sett: the Rest are widely different in their Expression, as appears by comparing 'em with the particular Fables to which they belong; which in most Cases may be done with Certainty. Nay, we have One Entire Fable of *Babrius*, about the *Swallow and Nightingale*, and another Large Fragment of Nine Lines, about *the Priests of Cybele*; and the Fables that answer to these in the Prose are now extant; and are so far from resembling *Babrius*'s Verses, that they have scarce a Word the same with 'em.

With

With what Face therefore could Dr. *Bentley* pronounce it, *Evidently apparent, that the Author of these Prose Fables did nothing else but Epitomize* Babrius *? 'Twould be full as good a Consequence, should one say; because we find, that Two or Three Fragments of *Ennius*, are with some little Difference plainly inserted into *Virgil*'s Æneid; *therefore* 'tis *Evident*, that *Virgil* did nothing else but transcribe *Ennius*. * P. 143.

After Dr. *Bentley*'s way of Arguing, I could easily prove, that all *Nevelet*'s Parcel is transpros'd, or (as he would call it) *traduc'd* †, not from Old *Babrius*'s Scazons, but the Modern *Gabrias*'s Iambicks. † P. 147. "That they are more "Recent than *Gabrias* I discover'd by this "means, I observ'd in 'em some Passages that "had a Poetical Turn, as in the 173d Fable,

Οὗτος κακὸς πῖνων τὸν ὑπογάστωρ.

"This I saw was an Iambic Verse; and (ha-"ving first seen it observ'd in *Nevelet*'s Note "upon this Fable) I presently suspected that "it was taken from *Gabrias*, and was soon "confirm'd in my Judgment: for upon con-"sulting his Version of the Fable, I found "this Verse there. Whence it Evidently ap-"pears, that the Author of this Parcel did "nothing else but enlarge upon this Sorry "Poet, and put him into Prose. I could go on producing Other Instances of the kind, which would make out the Point about *Gabrias* much more clearly and plainly than Dr. *Bentley* has made out His about *Babrius*; but I have a greater regard for my Own, and for

for my Reader's Time, than to throw it away upon such Trifles.

'Tis so far from being a Mark of Acuteness to point out a few Scazons or Iambicks in the Compass of a Book, that, on the contrary, 'tis hard to find a page of Greek Prose any where without 'em. *Aristotle* has long ago observ'd for the Greek, and *Tully* for the Latin, that those Languages run naturally into this Sort of Metre: and that 'tis difficult even in Common Discourse to avoid it (a). Nay, to shew how little can be made of such Conjectures as These, I dare undertake to find in these Fables any Sort of Verse that Dr. *Bentley* shall pitch upon; and many more Verses of Some Sorts, than the Dr. has produc'd Scazons. I will give him an Instance or two of this kind, to shew, how very fanciful 'tis possible for a man to be in these matters, with how very small Grounds.

(a) Μάλιστα γὰρ τῶν μέτρων ἡ ἰαμβεῖα φθέγγεται λέγοντες. Arist. 3. Rhet. c. 8.

And agen —— μάλιστα δὲ λανθάνειν τῶν μέτρων τὸ ἰαμβεῖον. σημεῖον δὲ τούτου, ὅτι μάλιστα δὲ ἰαμβεῖα λέγομεν ἐν τῇ κοινῇ διαλέκτῳ πρὸς ἀλλήλους.

Senarios & Hipponacteos (i. e. *Iambicks, and Scazons*) effugere vix possumus; magnam enim partem ex Iambis nostra constat Oratio.

Cic. Orator.

The Fable of *the Fly*, in the Greek Prose runs thus, Μυῖα ἐμπεσοῦσα εἰς χύτραν ζωμοῦ ἑψομένου, ἐπειδὴ ἐπνίγετο ἤδη μέλλουσα, ἔφη πρὸς ἑαυτὴν, ἀλλ' ἔγωγε ἐβιβρωσκα, καὶ πέπωκα, καὶ λέλουμαι, κἂν ἀποθάνω, οὐδὲν μέλει μοι. Now 'tis the Easiest thing in the World to resolve these Words into *Hemijambi*, or *Anacreontick*, with some Slight Allowances in the Measure.

Μυῖ' ἐμπεσοῦσα ζωμοῦ χύτρᾳ
. . . . . ἑψομένου
Ἔπνιγετ' ἤδη μέλλουσα,
. . . . . .

Ἔφη πρὸς

Ἔχομι μὲν βίβωκα
Πίτυκα, χ' λίλιμμαι
Θανεῖν ἐδὲν μέλει μοι·

And this Conjecture, I might say, is so much the more probable, because not only the Numbers, but even the Humor and Matter of the Fable is Anacreontical.

Agen, in the Fable of *the Nightingale and the Hawk*, we have these Trochaicks,

Ἀλλ' ἴχομ', ἄρπαν ἂν εἶλεν,
Εἰ τοιοῦτ' ἐν χερσὶν ἐπίμλω &c.

In the Conclusion of the Fable of the *Frogs*, we have these Words,

—— ἀν δὲ
Ὕδωρ ξηρανθῇ, πῶς ἀναβησόμεθα;

Who doesn't see that this Fable was written in Long and Short Verses?

That of the *Lover and his Two Mistresses* is told twice in the Present Collection; in the Parcel printed before *Nevelet* thus, Ἀνὴρ τις μέσων ἔχων ἤβων δύο ἴσχε ἑταίρας, μίαν μὲν γραῦν, τὴν δὲ ἑτέραν νέαν· τύπτει ἡ μὲν γραῦς τὰς μέλανας τρίχας ἅπασιν, ἵν' γλαφυρὸν τοῦτον θηλάζοι· ἡ δὲ νέα τὰς πολιάς, ὡς ἂν μόνον φαλακρὸν ἑτέρᾳ καὶ ὅμοιον ἀπέφηνεν. Now the greatest part of this will run naturally into Long and Short Verse,

Ἀνήρ τις . . . . . δύ' ἴσχεν ἑταίρας,
[Πλὴν ἓν] μίαν μὲν γραῦν, τὴν δ' ἑτέραν δὲ νέαν·
Τούτων δ' ἡ μὲν γραῦς μέλανας τρίχας [ἀεὶ] ἔπλεεν
[Ἕως τερπνὸν, ἂν θὴς δ'] ἡ νέα τὰς πολιάς·
. . . . . ἀνὴρ φαλακρὸν καὶ ὅμοιον ἀπέφηνεν.

But

But notwithſtanding theſe near Reſemblances of ſeveral Sorts of Verſe, that are to be met with in our Proſe Fables, I am far from thinking that the Fables in which they they are found were written firſt in Anacreontic, Trochaic, or Elegiac Meaſure, and from thence made Proſe; and ſhould any one pretend to prove it from hence, they would engage I think in a Ridiculous Attempt. The Compoſers of theſe Fables might accidentally ſo range their Words as to fall into theſe Meaſures; the Beſt and the Worſt Writers often do ſo, without being aware of it: In Sir *William Temple*'s and Dr. *Bentley*'s Engliſh, how many *Blank Verſes* are there, which they themſelves never thought of, or intended? and therefore nothing, I ſay, can be built upon ſuch Vain and Empty Conjectures.

However, ſo well ſatisfied is the Dr. with his Performances of this kind, that he triumphantly concludes, *Thus have I prov'd One Half of the Fables that carry the Name of Æſop to be a Thouſand Years more Recent than He* †. His Proof, without any manner of Miſrepreſentation, or Ridicule, ſtands thus.

† Diſſert. p. 146.

"If out of an 136 Fables, *Two*, by leaving "out Some, and putting in Other Words, "and changing the Order of 'em, look like "Two Fragments of *Babrius* preſerv'd in *Suidas*, then 'tis evident that theſe were tranſpros'd from *Babrius*: and if in *Four more* "there are ſome Reſemblances of Scazons, of "which no Footſteps appear any where elſe, "then theſe alſo were tranſpros'd from Scazons; and thoſe Scazons muſt be *Babrius*'s: "and if the Paſſages in theſe *Six* Fables are

"bor-

" borrow'd from *Babrius*, then the whole " Parcel of an 136 (among which theſe Six " chance to be found) are certainly Later " than *Babrius*: and if they are Later than " *Babrius*, (whoſe Age we certainly know no " more of than that he liv'd before *Athenæus*) " then they are certainly above a Thouſand " Years more Recent than *Æſop*.

Having by this Subtle Chain of Conſequences drawn down the Date of Half the Fables a Thouſand Years below *Æſop*, he goes on with the ſame Clearneſs and Strength of Reaſon to prove the Other Half more Modern than They. *That they are not from* Æſop's *Own Hand, we may know, he ſays, from the* LXXth *of* the Serpent and the Crabfiſh, *which is taken from a* Scolion, *or* Catch, *much older than* Æſop (*a*). That this *Scolion* is Older than *Æſop*, he has no manner of Authority to ſay; *Athenæus*, who cites it, intimates nothing of the Age of it; and if it were Older than *Æſop*, might not *Æſop* take Occaſion from it to raiſe a Fable of his Own? So that the Dr's Proof has theſe two ſmall Defects, that the bottom on which he goes is a Precarious Aſſertion, and the Inference he draws from thence wild and unreaſonable.

(*a*) Diſſer. p. 146.

After this, he objects againſt a New *Beaſt*, and a New *Bird*, to be met with in our preſent Sett, which were utterly unknown to all the Ancient Naturaliſts. As to his *Beaſt*, βάτραχος, 'tis I own a New Sort of Monſter; and ſo New, as not to be met with in the Elder MSS of *Æſop*, nor even in ſeveral of the Modern ones. *Voſſius*'s MS, and Two in the *Bodly-*

Library, instead of βυτάρη ἀκτερόεντα read βρῶμά τ' ἰορίνεα: this βρῶμά τ', 'tis likely, might be βῦν at first, (which may be observ'd throughout the Fables to be the Prey the Lyon generally feeds upon †) and from the Confusion of those Two Words, βῦν and ἰορίνεα, our New Sort of Beast might easily arise.

† From hence the Epithet of βυτάρης. Βυτάρης ὁ τὸν μῦλον ἀπεχθῶν ἔχτο λέων. *Suidas* in βυτάρης.

Perhaps too the Original of the word Βύτταλις may be trac'd from the same heedlessness of a Transcriber. It might formerly have been Ὄυταλις, the same with Ὄρταλις, (as ἰυτάλιχθ is with ἰρτάλιχθ *) and the B, which stood there for the Number of the Fable, being joyn'd to the first word Ὄυταλις, might create this New Species of a Bird.

* Ὀρτάλιχοι, ἰς μέτρω πτηνοὶ τινὲς, ἢ ἰς ἀλεκτρυόνας, ἢ πετεινάρια. Hesych. *in* Ὀρτάλιχοι: *for which* Nicander *uses* Ὀρτάλιχες. *If* πετεινάρια *in* Hesychius *may be interpreted* Aves Pensiles, *Birds hung up in Cages, the Wording and Matter of the Fable will fall in very naturally with this Guess about* Ὄυταλις; *for it begins thus,* Βύταλις ἀπὸ τῆθ βορίθ ἐκρέματο ——

But whether or no This be the way in which these Words crept into the Text is not worth insisting upon; it seems plain to me that they sprung from some Corruption of it, since they are not to be met with, that I can find, in any other Author, Ancient or Modern, or in any Other Fable of *Æsop*, but these Two only. And if a Modern Corruption of any place in a Book prove the Book it self Modern, there is no Book but may be prov'd so.

Upon the same false Ground his next Objection about the *Hebraism* is built: instead of

of βοῦν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, *Voſſius*'s MS. reads, ἴσατο ἡ διελογίζετο. Dr. *Bentley*, who pretends to ſuch a *Sagacity in the way of Critic*, and talks as if he had conſulted all the MSS of *Æſop* upon this occaſion, ſhould methinks have obſerv'd theſe Various Readings, and have had the Skill to make uſe of 'em.

There are yet Two Fables more in this Sett, which the Dr. will prove not to be *Æſop*'s, One, becauſe he finds it word for word almoſt in *Apthonius* (he means *Aphthonius*): and it may be *Aphthonius* found it word for word before in *Æſop*; and then we are as we were. The Other, he ſays, is a Paraphraſe on the CCLXXXIV^th^ in *Neveletus*'s Parcel: and why may not that in *Nevelet* be as well an Abridgment of This?

Having laid down theſe Undeniable Premiſes, he ſolidly Concludes thus, *This Collection THEREFORE is more Recent than that Other* *. Never was the poor Particle *therefore* ſo miſerably abus'd; he has mention'd but *Six* Fables out of an *Hundred and fifty*, and has given us no tolerable proof that any One of thoſe Six are Modern; and yet in the Strength of what he has done ventures to pronounce the Whole Sett to be ſo. Either Dr. *Bentley* muſt be a very Thoughtleſs Writer, or he muſt hope to meet with very Thoughtleſs Readers: and ſuch I am ſure they muſt be, if theſe ways of arguing paſs upon 'em.

* Differt. p. 147.

What has Our Critic then been doing all this while? he pretends to prove, that the whole *Three hundred Fables are at leaſt a Thouſand Years Younger than Æſop*; he has attempted this Proof particularly but upon *Twelve* of

them; and that in a very Weak Inconcluſive manner. However, ſhould I give him up theſe *Twelve*, and add *Two hundred* more to the account, and allow all theſe to have been Later than *Æſop*; yet ſtill there are Enow left, to ſupport Their Pretences, who make *Æſop* an Author, and take Some of theſe Fables to be Originals of His Compoſing. Nobody imagin'd that All, or Half the Fables, that have gone under the Name of *Æſop*, are His; or that Any of 'em almoſt are in the very ſame Words and Syllables, that they were in, when they came out of His hands. They have doubtleſs undergone ſome more, ſome leſs Alterations: but if under all theſe Changes ſtill the Same Little Story in its Chief Circumſtances, and the ſame Simplicity in telling it; the ſame Humorous Turn of Thought, and in good meaſure the ſame Words too have been preſerv'd; there is Enough of *Æſop* left, whereby we may make a true Judgment of his Spirit, and Genius, and manner of Performance. When Dr. *Bentley* ſhall clearly have made out, either that None of theſe Fables came from *Æſop* himſelf; or, if they did, yet that in the very Form and Caſt of 'em, as well as the Expreſſion, they have been ſince ſo totally alter'd, that they deſerve not to be call'd the Same; it will then be time enough to own, that we are unable to judge of *Æſop*'s merit by any thing in the Preſent Collection: but till that is done, we may ſafely enjoy our Opinions, and They that have admir'd *Æſop*, may venture to go on, and admire him ſtill.

All

All that Dr. *Bentley* has hitherto offer'd upon the ſubject of *Æſop* is ſo ſlight and inconſiderable, that one would naturally imagine it to be his *Own*, and believe him when he ſays, that he intended to give us nothing, but what had *eſcap'd the Obſervation of others* * : and yet 'tis certain that Nothing almoſt which he has ſaid could eſcape the Obſervation of any man that look'd into *Nevelet*; in whoſe Preface, and Short Notes, the very ſame Remarks are made, without any thing of the Oſtentation and Ill-reaſoning that here accompanies 'em. The Reader will know whether I have injur'd Dr. *Bentley* in this Imputation, after he has given himſelf the trouble of viewing the following Accounts, wherein I have compar'd *Nevelet*'s Old Obſervations with Dr. *Bentley*'s New Ones.

* Diſſert. p. 135.

Sect. I. Dr. *Bentley* obſerves, that One in *Ariſtophanes* tells another, that he is unlearn'd and unacquainted with *Æſop*, ἰδ' Αἰσωπου πεπαίπας.

Unde eſt Ariſtophanicum *Convitium*, ἰδ' Αἰσωπου πεπαίπας.

Nev. Præf. p. 2.

Sect. II. Socrates *eſſay'd to put the* Æſopic *Fables into Verſe.*

Socrates Æſopi *Fabulas dignas judicavit quas Verſibus includeret.* Id. ibid.

Sect. V. *Afterward came one* Babrius, *that gave a New Turn to the Fables into Choliambic Verſe.* Suid. in βαβριος.

De Gabriâ *itidem eſt ut moneam, ſcripſit Ille Iambico metro ejus generis quod eſt* τῶν σκαζόντων, *ut* Suidas *notat.*

Præf. p. 4.

Ibid. *There's One* Gabrias *yet extant, that has compriz'd each*

Injuria Babriæ *ſit cum ei Tetraſtichia quæ vulgò exſtant*

each Fable in four Sorry Iambicks; but our Babrias was an Author of another Size.

Ibid. There's a Noble Fable of his yet preſerv'd at the End of Gabrias, of the Swallow and the Nightingale.

Ibid. Suidas brings many Quotations out of him as this, &c.

Sect. VI. Here Dr. Bentley has the Ingenuity to own his acquaintance with Neveletus, where he takes little or nothing out of him.

Sect. VII. That they are recenter than even Babrius I diſcover'd by this means; I obſerv'd in 'em ſeveral Paſſages, that were not of a piece with the reſt, but had a Turn and Compoſition plainly Poetical; as in the CCLXIII^d Fable, which begins thus, Ὅτε ταῦτα ἐθέλοντα χωλὸς ἴαμβος ἴδοιμι: This I ſaw was a Choliambic Verſe, and I preſently ſuſpected that the Writer had taken it from Babrius: whence it evidently

adſcribuntur, quæ Babriam pro ſuis agnoſcere puderet.

Id. ibid.

At in τετραεσχοπ illis ne unicus quidam Scazon præterquam in ultimâ Fabulâ τὸ χαλεπὸν ἐ, καὶ ἐ; qua ſola reſtat naufragii tabula.

Id. ibid.

Ex pluribus Babriæ Fragmentis quæ extant apud Suidam, nonnulla congram, &c. and then he gives us 14 Verſes of Babrius, collected from Suidas.

Nev. Not. ad Fab. CCLXXIII. Ὅτε ταῦτα ἐθέλοντα χωλὸς ἴαμβος ἴδοιμι. Verſus Iambicus Scazon, quales Babrius ſcripſit, nec ſatis ſcio num Babriæ ipſius. And agen, Fab. CLXXV. Ἀνὴρ πατρίδος ἐπιμελὴς ἔσεσθαι, &c. Redolent hæc ut plurimum alia harum fabularum loca Verſus Iambicos: atq; utinam extarent hi Verſus, unde hæc deſumpta ſunt; Babriam ipſum quantum video, integrum haberemus,

evidently appears that the Author of that Parcel did nothing elſe but EPITOMIZE Babrius, *and put him into Proſe.*

Ibid. *There's a Noble Fragment of* Babrias *belonging to the* CCXLV^th *Fable about the Prieſts of* Cybele, *given us by* Natalis Comes, Γάλλοις ἀγάλμασι &c.

beremus, cujus jam Umbram tantùm & EPITOMEN habemus.

Egregiè verò rem totam deſcribit Babrias: *quod Fragmentum debemus* Natali Comiti; *nullibi quippe quod ſciam extat præterquàm in ipſius Mythologiâ,* Γάλλοις ἀγάλμασι &c. Not. in Fab. CCXLV.

I muſt ſtop a little here to commend the Dr. for being ſo true to his Author, as even to copy his Miſtakes. *Nevelet* did not know of any Writer before *Natalis Comes*, where this Fragment was to be met with; and therefore our Diſſertator, that goes no further than *Nevelet*, could know no more than He did. However he Ought to have known ſomewhat more; becauſe he pretends † to have read what *Tzetzes* ſays of *Babrius*. Had he done as he pretends, he would have found *Babrius* mention'd in *Tzetzes* together with this very Fragment; and that in ſuch a manner, that 'twas impoſſible to ſee the one, and yet overlook the other. For thus *Tzetzes* enters upon the mention of *Babrius* *,

† Diſſert. p. 140.

* Par. 475

Ἄκουε δ' Βαβρίου δ' τῶν χωλῶν ἰάμβων,
Γάλλοις ἀγάλμασι &c.

Sect. VIII. *There is no MS. above* 300 *Years old,*

Ex MSS. illis quos habui,

which

which has the Fables according to that Copy — Coming abroad firſt with Æſop's *Life, writ by* Planudes, *they are juſtly believ'd to be owing to the ſame Writer.*

Ibid. *The* LXXVth *about the* Æthiopian, *is taken almoſt word for word out of the* VIth *of* Apthonius.

habuit Æſopi *Fabulas, quas à* Planude (*ut* Æſopi *Vita eſt*) *ſcriptas exiſtimo.*
Nev. Præf.

Inter Æſopicas *Fabulas legitur quoq; hæc paucis immutatis ſub Titulo* Αἰθίοψ.
Nev. Not. in Fab. VI. Aphthon.

Thus far I have had leiſure to trace the Dr. in *Nevelet*; and I need trace him no farther; for Theſe Hints, which appear to be taken from thence are the only ones that he pretends to build any thing upon. Whatever he has added of his Own (if he has added any thing) has been already ſhewn to be either a Miſtake, or nothing to his Purpoſe. And now let me put a Grave Queſtion to him; with what Modeſty, or Conſcience, he could tell his Reader, at the Entrance of this Diſſertation, that he intended to offer ſuch things *only, as had eſcap'd the Obſervation of Others?* when 'tis manifeſt, that, as far as we have hitherto gone in his Remarks (that is in Three Quarters of 'em) he has done nothing but plunder'd *Nevelet*. 'Tis true, as he wittily obſerves †, *Good Wits jump* ſometimes: however I ſhould think it a pretty Nice matter for the Beſt Wits in the World to jump ſo often together, ſo very evenly!

† Differt. p. 33.

What he has put together in the next Paragraph, concerning the Life and Manners of

Æſop,

Æsop, with a great Shew of Reading was already collected to his hand, out of *Eustathius*, *Plutarch*, *Agathias*, *Philostratus*, *Pliny*, *Herodotus*, *Suidas*, and *Strabo*; and the passages from thence printed at large in the End of *Camerarius*'s Fables. Dr. *Bentley* presents these to us with the same Pomp and Pleasure, as if he had been the first Producer of 'em; and makes no addition to their Number, but by One Poor Quotation out of the Scholiast on *Aristophanes*, and another known passage of *Phædrus*.

When he was mentioning (*a*) *Meziriac*, *Vavasor*, and *Bayle*, as Men that had gone before him on this Subject, it would have been honourably done of him, not to have forgotten Those, whom he was so much more beholden to, *Nevelet*, and *Camerarius*. But I find he's asham'd of his Neareſt Acquaintances; and, after such Instances of his Ingenuity, I believe his Neareſt Acquaintances will be asham'd of Him.

(*a*) Differ. *p.* 135.

Our Critic having spent his Small Artillery here and there upon a Fable, without much Success, grows Peevish, and is resolv'd to be reveng'd on the Poor Monk that collected 'em, *Planudes*; who, as much a Monk as he was, never, I believe, gave any man such Course Language from his Cell, as he now receives from Court. He is call'd here *an Ideot of a Monk, that has given us a Book* [the Life of Æsop] *which perhaps cannot be match'd in any Language for Ignorance and Nonsence* (*b*). As for *Planudes* himself, I must confeſs I have not the Deepeſt Veneration for his Character; but

(*b*) Ibid. *p.* 147.

but neither can I think so despicably of him, as the Lofty Dr. *Bentley* does, because I find him well spoken of by men of Good Knowledge and Judgment, and even by his Adversaries Themselves (*a*). Nay, Dr. *Bentley*, I think, gives an account of him, not at all to his disadvantage, where he says, that That Sett of Fables he put out was *of his own drawing up*; amongst which, there are several so well turn'd, so exactly copied from Nature, and built on such a true knowledge of Human Life and Affairs, that 'tis plain he was neither an *Ideot*, nor a *Monk*, that compos'd 'em. This is an Honour therefore misplac'd on *Planudes*, and which he deserves as little as he does that Scurrilous Language, which the Dr. (ever happy in Inconsistencies) has in that very Page bestow'd upon him. *Nevelet*, and *Vavasor* were a little too hasty in their Conclusions on this matter, and spake too largely, when from some Fables that reliſh'd of *Planudes*'s Style and Way, they inferr'd that All were of His Composing. Dr. *Bentley* has taken up the same Inference from an argument of as little weight: the

(*a*) The Learned Cardinal *Bessario*, in a Treatise he wrote against *Planudes* long after his Death, has this Apostrophe to him, Οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐγὼ σὺ ἀνδρῶν ἄριστε καὶ σοφώτατε καὶ ἱστοῦλω ὄντι πάνυ ἐξαισιωνύμῳ πιθήκῳ, ὅτου ἡ διαβεβλημένη ἐς φιλοσοφίαν καὶ λογίους, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα μὲν μαθημάτων ἰδιώτας ὄντας, ἐν δυσμενείᾳ ὄντας δι' ἐς ἀτιμίαν &c. *Opusc. Aurea*, p. 622. *Arcudius*, the Collector of these Pieces, and who differs as much in his Sentiments from *Planudes*, as *Bessario* does, has in his Preface, this Honourable Character of him: Planudem, *Monachum Græcum, celeberrimum Philosophum, & Theologum, & in utraque Lingua versatissimum.* And the Epithet Σοφώτατος which *Bessario* bestows upon him, is given him also in the Titles of his Manuscript Pieces, Τῶ Σοφωτάτῳ ἱερομονάχῳ Μαξ. τῷ Πλαν. &c.—which shews, that tho' *Planudes* was a *Monk*, yet the Scholars of those Times were far from thinking him an *Ideot*.

the Reason (and the only Reason he gives) for his believing 'em drawn up by *Planudes*, is, that *there is no MS. any where above* 300 *Years old, that has the Fables according to that Copy. No MS! any where!* Very Extensive Words; 'tis pretty difficult to answer for All the Libraries of *Europe*: for, as a Late Critic observes, *Sæpe non licet Viris doctis MSS. adire, seu ob Distantiam Locorum, seu ob Præfectorum Bibliothecis invidiam, seu ob alia Impedimenta quæ memorare nihil attigit* *. *Learned Men are often debarr'd the Use of MSS, either by their Distance from 'em, or by the Envious Temper of those that have the Custody of 'em; or by some Other Sort of Hindrances* ——— as for Example, when they expect to have those kind of Favours *gratuitously* done 'em. But supposing he had an Exact Account of All the *European* MSS, yet how does he know, but that there may be one at *Fez*? the most inaccessible Library in the World, next to that at *St. James's*.

* Art Crit. p. 172.

This was an Assertion fit to be laid down by Dr. *Bentley*, because impossible to be prov'd; and, I believe, not difficult to be disprov'd: for, as much out of the way of those things as I live, I have casually heard of a MS, Older than *Planudes*, that has the Fables according to His Copy; *Vossius*'s MS. I mean, which tho' I have not seen my self, yet better Judges than I am, who have seen it, assure me, that it is about 500 Years Old, and that *Vossius* himself always esteem'd it so. 'Tis now at *Leyden*, I think; and might have been nearer, but for Some-body's management. I need look out for no more Instances; against a Negative, One

[is

is as good as a Thouſand. If all the MSS, that have the Fables according to *Planudes*'s Copy were evidently Younger than He, yet we could not from thence certainly collect, that He was the Author of 'em; whereas if One of 'em happens to be Older than He, we may be pretty ſure he was not.

As for *Planudes*'s Life of *Æſop*, I can't indeed think it a Book *not to be match'd in any Language for Ignorance and Nonſenſe* *; becauſe in ſome Languages I think it may: however I have no Great Opinion of it. There are in it Several Idle Trifling Stories, told in ſuch a Fabulous Way, that one would think *Planudes* meant to ſuit the Life to the Book which follows; and writ out of his Own Invention for want of Authorities. And yet neither dare I reject every Circumſtance of his Account as fictitious, that I do not find confirm'd by Elder Authors: he might make uſe of Books that never came down to us; a great deal of Good Hiſtory periſh'd in the ſacking of *Conſtantinople*: or he might from the Same Books which we have now in our hands, take ſome Hints, which we have not yet obſerv'd in 'em; and which it would be very Raſh and Immodeſt in Us to pronounce not to be there, till we have read over all the Greek Authors carefully, and ſifted 'em throughly. And this is particularly fit to be ſaid to Dr. *Bentley*, who, for want of ſuch a Prudent Diſtruſt of his own Knowledge, has been guilty of a Groſs Miſtake. The Circumſtance in *Planudes*'s Account, which he pitches upon to expoſe, is that of *Æſop*'s *Ugineſs*. He had met with a

* Diſſert. P. 147.

Large Collection of Teſtimonies concerning *Æſop* in *Camerarius*'s Fables; in none of which there was any Hint of his Deformity: and he concluded therefore, that there muſt and could be none any where elſe; and that This was certainly a Fiction of *Planudes*. And now how does he inſult over the poor *Ignorant Monk* * on this occaſion? how unmercifully does he uſe him? he asks him, *what Revelation he had about* Æſop's *Deformity? for he muſt needs learn it*, he ſays, *by Dream and Viſion, and not by Ordinary Methods of Knowledge. He liv'd about Two thouſand Years after* Æſop; *and in ALL that Tract of TIME there's not ONE SINGLE Author, that has given the LEAST HINT that* Æſop *was Ugly* †. *Caſaubon*, or *Gerhard Voſſius*, who had either of 'em read Ten times as much as Dr. *Bentley*, would not have talk'd at this rate; becauſe Neither of 'em, as Learned as They were, had read All that was written, or remember'd all they had read. But Dr. *Bentley*, in the ſtrength of *Camerarius*'s Collections, is poſitive, that not ONE SINGLE Author before *Planudes*'s time, has given the LEAST HINT of *Æſop*'s Ugline ſs. If he would not be Angry, I would venture, out of my ſmall Stock of Reading to ſupply him with One, and Him an Author of great Note, *Euſtathius*; who in the beginning of his Comment on the *Odyſſes* (*p.* 17.) derives the word Αἴσωπος from ἀΐθω, ἀΐσσω, τὸ λάμπω, and ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰξύος, ſays he, Αἴσωπος ἀπηρχιωμένος. I contend not for the Goodneſs of the Etymology, let it ſhift for it ſelf: but it is evidently built on a Suppoſition that *Æſop* was Ugly; and

* Differt. *p.* 149.

† Ibid.

and implys, that That Opinion was Common in *Eustathius*'s time, that is, about *Two hundred* Years before *Planudes* was born. Doubtless, that Learned *Parecboliſt* (to speak in Dr. *Bentley*'s Phrase) could have produc'd Authorities enow for this Opinion, tho' they are since lost: however He himself is a sufficient Authority to Us in the point, since he is not, as far as I can find, expressly contradicted in it by any One Ancient Writer; at least, he must be allow'd to screen *Planudes* from the Imputation of having invented this Particular to the Dishonour of *Æsop*: which he was so far from doing, that we have reason to think he might have this very passage of *Eustathius* in his Eye, where he tells us, that Αἴσωπος and Αἰθίοψ are the same (*a*), and that *Æsop* took his Name from his Uglineſs. The Groundwork of this Story then *Planudes* had either from *Eustathius*, or from some Elder Accounts, which both *Eustathius* and He equally transcrib'd; and upon this Groundwork it is probable he enlarg'd, in his Fanciful Way, and being satisfied that *Æsop* was Ugly in the main, was resolv'd to make him as Ugly as he could possibly, and to dress up a Monster in all imaginable Kinds of Deformity.

(*a*) Πεϱὶ χωλῆς, μέλαν, ὃθεν καὶ τὸ ὀνομα ἐσχε, τ' αὐτὸ δὲ Αἴσωπος τῷ Αἰθίοψ. Vit. Æſ. in initio. Planudes *here intimates the same Derivation of* Αἴσωπος *with* Eustathius; *that is, as to the Words themselves, from whence it comes: tho' he takes* ἄθω *in the Sense of* Uro, *and not of* Splendeo; *which he thinks the Easier Etymology, as needing no* Antiphrasis *to justifie it.*

Whether there be any Author, besides *Eustathius*, extant, who has made expreſs mention of *Æsop*'s Uglineſs, I am not now at leisure to enquire: sure I am there are in other

Wri-

Writers Remote Hints and Intimations of this Matter, ſuch as may fairly be ſuppos'd to imply it. When, in *Plutarch*'s Feaſt, one of the Gueſts thus rallies *Æſop*, ὦ τῶν βαλβῶν, ὦ ἡμίσεον τρέχεις, he ſeems to reflect upon his Ill-ſhape and Unweildineſs. *Lucian*, in his *Vera Hiſtoria* ſays, they us'd *Æſop* in *the Fortunate Iſlands* for a Γελωτοποιὸς, a *Buffoon*, or *Jeſter*, one that *made 'em Sport* (*a*); meaning I ſuppoſe that he did it as well by his Perſon and Outſide, as by his Ingenious and Divertive Fables; and indeed rather by the Firſt than the Latter: for his Fables, of themſelves, tho' they entertain and pleaſe us extreamly, yet do they not give us that Sort of Pleaſure which cauſes Laughter. *Dion Chryſoſtome* therefore, in the Paſſage produc'd by Dr. *Bentley*, ſeems to diſtinguiſh between the τὸ γελοῖον of *Æſop*, and his μῦθοι· ἐπῄνεγκε αὐτὸν, ſays he, ᾠδόμενος ἐπὶ τῷ γελοίῳ ᾧ τοῖς μύθοις, implying, I think, that the One was not exactly the ſame with the Other. 'Tis true Every-body knows, that the *Æſopic* Fables were after *Æſop*'s time frequently call'd γελοῖα by the Greek Writers, and from thence *Ridicula* by *Avienus*: but 'tis not unlikely that the Original of this Uſe of the Word was from ſomething Ridiculous in the Geſture, Look, and Mimical Wit of *Æſop* that accompanied 'em, when he firſt told 'em; rather than from the Structure of the Fable it ſelf, which does not ſeem contriv'd to operate that way. I am willing to think therefore that the Name uſually given to theſe Fables

(*a*) Παρὰ δὲ Αἰσώπου ὁ Φρὺξ τοῦτο δὲ ἦν καὶ Γελωτοποιῷ χρῆν. P. 397.

bles, Γελοῖα, and the Office of Γελωτοποιὸς aſcrib'd to *Æſop*, carry in 'em ſome ſmall Hint of *Æſop*'s Uglineſs; for nothing is ſo Divertive, or raiſes Laughter ſo much as Deformity, eſpecially when Wit goes along with it. We may obſerve therefore, that when *Homer* has a mind to excite this Light Paſſion in his Serious Poem, he does it by the means of an Ugly Man (*), and an Ugly God (†); *Therſites* and *Vulcan* are, as I remember, the only Two Γελωτοποιὸι in the whole Iliad; the One on Earth, and the Other in Heaven.

'Tis dangerous converſing long with Dr. *Bentley*; for I find I have ſlip'd here, e're I was aware, into his manner of arguing: however, in this I will ſtill differ from him, that I offer theſe things as ſlight Gueſſes only, without laying any manner of Streſs upon 'em. I need 'em not, in order to ſhew the Dr. his Error, and this is not a place to do juſtice to the Argument: *Euſtathius*'s Single Teſtimony, without other Help, is ſufficient to bring Confuſion in our aſſuming Critic, who challeng'd Me and all the World to produce *One Single* Author before *Planudes*, that had given the *Leaſt Hint* that *Æſop* was Ugly.

Vavaſor, who ſtarted this thought to him (for This too is one of the Things *that have eſcap'd the Obſervation of Others*) mentions it with

---

(*) Ἀλλ' ἐ, τί ἰς εἶσατο χωλοίϊον Ἀργείοισιν
Βμμέναι· ὦκε δὲ ἀνὴρ ἦεν ἀνὰ ἶλυν ἐλθών. Il. β. 215.

Upon which *Euſtathius*, ὁ Θερσίτης πανοῦργος ὤν, καὶ αὐτόθεν γέλωτα ἐργαζόμενος.

(†) Ἀσβεστος δ' ὀρῶρτο γέλως μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν,
Ὡς ἴδον Ἥφαιστον ἀν δώμασι πολυσπλα. Il. α. 599.]

with Diſtruſt, and as a Suſpicion only; *Therſitem*, ſays he, *Homericum referebat Æſopus ortu habitu, & reliquâ facie, niſi & hic quoque imponit* Planudes (*p.* 25). Had Our Critic, when he took the Hint it ſelf from *Vavaſor*, taken alſo his Wary way of propoſing it, he might have ſav'd himſelf the Shame of being confuted: but it was a proper Occaſion for Dr. *Bentley* to be Peremptory, when even a *Jeſuit* was Modeſt.

The Method he has taken of improving *Vavaſor*'s Suſpicion into a Demonſtration, is, by running over *Camerarius*'s Teſtimonies, and ſhewing, that in None of 'em there is any account of *Æſop*'s Deformity, and that moſt of 'em are (as he thinks) inconſiſtent with it. The Learning here is not his Own, but the Logic moſt certainly is; for I dare ſay, never any man ſo reaſon'd before him. I will give the Reader ſome account of it, after I have deſir'd him to remember, that the Point in Debate between Dr. *Bentley* and the World, is, not whether *Æſop* was Ugly to that Degree *Planudes* has merrily repreſented him to be (No-body was ever Silly enough to imagine it, nor did *Planudes* himſelf dream of being thus far credited): but the Diſpute is, in general, whether *Æſop* were Ugly, or not? Our Critic denies that he was, in Vertue of his Old Argument, *the Silence and Prætermiſſion of Authors*; and the Sum of whatever he has ſaid on this occaſion comes to thus much. "It does "not appear from Ancient Authors, that he "was *a Lump of Deformity*, and a *Scarecrow*; "*therefore* it is *certain*, he was not any ways

" deform'd; and therefore it is *probable* he
(a) P. 157. " was very handsome (*a*). His Particulars are as follow.

In Plutarch's Convivium, *No-body*, he says, *drolls on Æsop's Ugly Face, which could hardly*
(b) P. 149. *have escap'd, if he had such an Ill one* (*b*). I own No-body there drolls on *the Mien of his Face* (to use a *Bentleyism*); but the Mien of his Body, and his Natural Unweildiness, I have shewn to be touch'd on: and their mentioning any One Instance of his Uglines, is as sure a Sign of his being Ugly, as if they had reckon'd up All. Had *Æsop* been so very Handsome as
(c) P. 157. Dr. *Bentley* tells us he was (*c*), the τῶν ἄγαν ἀκριβῶν ἐξήτασιν τρόπων of *Chilo* had been a Piece of Raillery very ill apply'd.

But " *Philostratus* has given us in two Books " a Description of a Gallery of Pictures, One " of which is *Æsop*, with a Chorus of Ani- " mals about him. There he is represented " smiling, and looking toward the Ground in " a Posture of Thought, but not a Word of " his Deformity; which, were it true, must " needs have been touch'd on in an account
(d) P. 149, " of a Picture (*d*). The Dr. imposes upon
150. us; the Picture he mentions is not design'd to represent *Æsop*, but his *Fables*; and by Their
* Μῦθοι Name it is call'd *. In it, indeed *Æsop* has a Place; and he is so far describ'd there as *Philostratus* had need of him, to express the Subject of his Piece; to have gone farther would have been an Impertinence, utterly inconsistent with *Philostratus*'s Character, who is a Short Writer, and exactly proper in his Circumstances. His Words are, *Æsop seems there, as*

if

if he were actually framing a Fable; His Smiling Face, and his Eyes fix'd upon the Earth, declare as much: the Painter knew very well that Fables are the Work only of Easie Minds.* Would the Dr. have had a Particular of *Æsop*'s Deformities inserted here? to what purpose? when in the very mention of his Name they were sufficiently understood; and would have been of no manner of use towards imprinting an Image of that Thoughtful Posture of *Æsop* the Artist chiefly design'd to express.

* Ὁ γὰρ δι-
μαί τινα
ὑφαίνει μῦ-
θον· τὸ γὰρ
μειδίαμα
τὸ σχοπ-
τὸν, καὶ οἱ
ὀφθαλμοὶ
κάτω τῆς
γῆς ἐχόν-
τες

τῶν δηλοῦσιν· διὸ καὶ ὁ ζωγράφος, ὅτι αἱ τοῦ μύθου ἐργάδες ἀνειμένης τῆς ψυχῆς εἰσιν. Εικ. γ.

Philostratus's Intention was, to describe a Gallery of Pleasure, hung round with fine and delightful Paintings: in his Account of One of these, he had occasion to mention *Æsop*, and with good Judgment omitted those Particulars in his Description of him which were neither Taking to the Eye, nor at all Instructive, with relation to his Design in introducing him. Dr. *Bentley*, I find, would have been improper enough to have describ'd him *Capape* on this occasion; but *Philostratus*, tho' a Sophist, knew better. There is a Like piece of Address observable in his First Picture, where *Vulcan*'s Engagement with *Scamander*, and his Victory over him is represented out of *Homer*; and which, I suppose, he plac'd in the Front of his Book, for the Honour of *Lemnos*, his Native Island: And for the Honour of That too, and to make his Draught perfectly pleasing, he gives us a *Vul-*

can as handsome, for ought appears to the contrary, as any Figure in his Gallery. Indeed he Ingeniously excuses the God's not appearing to be Lame, by saying, that the Rapid Motion, with which he seems to come from Heaven to the Combat with *Scamander*, must be suppos'd to cover that Defect: But he intimates nothing of his Other Deformities; tho' *Vulcan* was, according to the Poet's (†) account of him, as Ugly every way as *Æsop* was according to *Planudes*.

This, I hope, sufficiently accounts for *Philostratus*'s Omission; and as for the *Statue* erected to *Æsop*, at *Athens*, and made by the fam'd hand of *Lysippus*, it will be no argument of his Handsomness, till the Dr. can prove, that this was an Honour done to Handsome Men only; which it will be no Easie Matter to do, because there is an Unquestionable Instance of a Statue, made by this very *Lysippus*, and erected by order of the *Athenians*, to the Memory of a Man, full as Ugly as we need allow *Æsop* to have been: I will give it the Dr. immediately, e're I part with this Argument.

The Greeks, he says, *have several Proverbs about Deform'd Persons, as* Θερσίτου βλιμμικώτερος, Καμβὸς, &c. *but none upon* Æsop (*d*). All that follows from hence, is, that *Æsop* was not *Ugly to a Proverb*; which I willingly grant him, and am ready to leave *Planudes*'s account

(*d*) P. 150, 151.

25

(†) Ἡ, ἐ ἀπ' ἀκμοβίτοιο Πέλωρ ἄμπνυε δαίμων
Χωλεύων, ὑπὸ δὲ κνῆμαι ἴαινετο ἀγλαὶ &c.
Il. *p.* 410.

as far as this comes to: but he might be Ugly enough for all that; ſeveral have been ſo, that were never made Sayings of: I know Some, at this day, who Write as Uglily as ever *Æſop* Look'd; but their Style is not yet got into a Proverb, tho' perhaps hereafter it may; and therefore This inſtance I will not inſiſt on.

Agen, *Æſop*, he tells us, was *Cræſus*'s Ambaſſador to *Delphi* (*a*): he means, that he was ſent of an Errand by him * thither; for ſuch Mighty Monarchs as *Cræſus* did not uſe to make Other Mens Slaves, Their Ambaſſadors. But let his Title be as Glorious as the Dr. pleaſes, his Perſon might nevertheleſs be Contemptible; unleſs the Dr. can prove, that the *Delphians* were as Nice of Temper as the *Turks*, and would pay no Regard to the Publick Miniſter of a Prince, unleſs he were Tall and Comely. Whatever *Æſop*'s Perſon, or his Character were, They ſhew'd, I am ſure, no great Veneration for Either, when they tumbl'd him down their Precipice.

(*a*) Ibid.

* ἐπίσχειν ἀπαλλάξοντος, ſays Plutarch, *in* Conviv. *if that piece may be allow'd to be quoted ſeriouſly for good Hiſtory.*

After all, the Dr's Reaſoning upon this Circumſtance muſt be allow'd to be Juſt; if *Æſop* were Short and Ugly, it is plain, as he pleaſantly obſerves, that he could never make a *Proper* Ambaſſador.

There is another Objection drawn from *Æſop*'s being a *Polite Courtier*, and a Man of Addreſs: what if he were? Many, I ſuppoſe, have been ſo, who were no Beauties! Yes, but he was ſo, to that degree, as to *rebuke* Solon *for his Gruff and Clowniſh Behaviour with* Cræſus, *and tell him, that he muſt converſe with Princes,* ἢ ὡς ἥδιστα, ἢ ὡς ἥκιστα, *either Agreeably, or not at all* (*b*). The

(*b*) P. 151.

Thing he ſaid was Handſome, I grant; but muſt *He* needs be Handſome that ſaid it? I thought Ugly People had ſometimes been as Witty and as Wiſe as their Neighbors. But ſince he has mention'd this Aphoriſm of *Æſop*'s, and profeſſes to approve it, I muſt tell him, 'twere well if he'd follow it too, when the Itch of contradicting Great Men is upon him; and reſolve to oppoſe his Betters ἢ ἐς ἦθος, ἢ ἐς ἄκρον; either not at all, or with Decency.

Dr. *Bentley* has yet One Reflection behind in behalf of *Æſop*; he has reſerv'd it for the very Laſt Place in his Book; and we know him to be ſuch a Maſter in Good Writing, that we may from thence be ſure 'tis a fine one. Rhodopis, Æſop's *fellow-Slave*, *was*, it ſeems, *the greateſt Beauty of her Age: if therefore* (ſays he) *we may gueſs him by his Companion and* Contubernalis, *we muſt needs believe him a Comely Perſon* (*a*). This puts me in mind of his Argument about *Alaſa* (*b*), which he proves to be upon ſuch a Coaſt of *Sicily*, becauſe it happens to be mention'd with ſome Towns that are certainly upon that Coaſt; and which I have prov'd for that very Reaſon not to be there, becauſe it is mention'd elſewhere, with ſome Other Towns, that are certainly not upon that Coaſt. *If* Rhodopis *were extreamly handſome*, Æſop, *her fellow-Slave muſt be ſo too!* which is as if I ſhould ſay, it was impoſſible that *Little Jeffery* ſhould be ſuch a *Dwarf* as he is repreſented to be, becauſe the *Tall Porter* and He were fellow-Servants. Muſt *Æſop*'s Maſter needs buy his Slaves as we do Coach-horſes

(*a*) P. 152.

(*b*) Vide p. 124 of this Book.

horſes in Pairs? and be as careful exactly to match 'em? Perhaps *Xanthus*, or *Iadmon*, or whoever he was, (for Authors differ) might be a little wantonly inclin'd; and having purchas'd *Rhodopis* for his Own Uſe, might fear, leſt his Wife ſhould return the Injury he did her; and ſo took *Æſop* into his Houſe, who he knew would be no Temptation to her: or perhaps he pitch'd upon an Ugly He ſlave, that he might be ſure to keep the Fair She-ſlave to himſelf; and made uſe of *Æſop* as a kind of *Kuzlir-Aga*, to inſpect his *Seraglio*. After all, what if I ſhould turn the Tables, and ſay, That *Herodotus* and *Pliny*'s mentioning this Little Particular, is a confirmation of the receiv'd Opinion about *Æſop*'s Deformity? If *He* were as remarkably Ugly as *She* was Handſome, the Obſervation indeed was pretty, and not unworthy of thoſe Authors; but Otherwiſe, 'tis Flat enough to have been made by Dr. *Bentley*.

One would think the Dr. in Jeſt, when he puts ſuch things as Theſe upon Us for Arguments; whereas He propoſes 'em ſeriouſly and in good earneſt, and fancies he has done wonders in the ſtrength of em. To convince him, if it be poſſible, of the Weakneſs and Abſurdity of his Proofs, I will (as I did once before *) try 'em upon Another Subject; and ſee how far they will be allow'd to hold.

Whatever *Æſop* was, *Socrates*, we are ſure, was exceſſively Ugly: Thus he is in ſhort deſcrib'd by *Xenophon* (*a*), and St. *Jerome* (*b*): *Flat-nos'd, Goggle-ey'd, Wide-mouth'd, Thick-lip'd, Pot-belly'd, Bandy-leg'd* (*c*).

* *In the Anſwer to the Diſſertation on* Phalaris.

(*a*) *In* Sym. c. 4, 5. (*b*) Adv. Jovin. l. 1, p. 51. (*c*) *All theſe particulars, but the Laſt, are taken from* Xenophon.

Notwithſtanding this, in that way of *Ratiocination* Dr. *Bentley* has made uſe of, I will prove him to have been a very Lovely and Beautiful Perſon. I will do it by Every One of the Arguments he has urg'd, except the Firſt, taken from *Philoſtratus*'s Gallery; in which *Socrates*, the Famous Perſecuter of *Sophiſts*, we may be ſure, could have no place: but I ſhall make amends for the want of This Proof, by a New one of my Own, every whit as much to My Purpoſe as This is to Dr. *Bently*'s.

Thus then Our Man of Criticiſm has taught Us to Speak, and Argue—"The *Athenians* ſet "up a Noble *Statue* * to the Honour and Me- "mory of *Socrates*: had he been ſo Ugly as "ſome would make him, it had been kinder to "his Memory to let that alone. But the Fa- "mous *Lyſippus* was the Statuary † that made "it. And muſt ſo great an Hand be employ'd "to dreſs up a Lump of Deformity?

* Diog. Laert. in Socrate. Tertul. in Apol.

† Ἀνεθήκατο τὸν ἄνδρα ἐς τὴν Ἀκαδήμειαν. Laer. ibid.

"The Greeks have ſeveral *Proverbs* about "Perſons deform'd, Θερσίτου βλάμμα, οὐδὲ χθὲς κο- "ρώνη &c: Our *Socrates*, if ſo Ugly, had been "in the firſt Rank of 'em: eſpecially when "his Statue had ſtood there to put every-body "in mind of it.

"He was ſo far a Favorite of *Archelaus*, King "of *Macedonia*, that he courted him to come, "and live with him *: but would ſuch a Mon- "ſter have been a fit Companion for a Prince? "He is known to have been one of the beſt "Speakers, and a Man of the greateſt Addreſs "and Inſinuation of any in his time; he had all "the Chief Perſons of *Athens* continually about "him, and was ever inſtructing 'em in the Du- "ties of Humanity and Courteſie, and all man-

* Ariſt. Rhet. l. 2.

"ner

"ner of Sociable Virtues: Could such a Cha-
"racter, such a Station, or such Discourses be-
"fit *Socrates* if he was truly that Scarecrow he
"is represented to have been?

He sung, he play'd upon the Music (*a*), he danc'd (*b*), he wrote Verses (*c*): he was every way an Accomplish'd Person; and his Conversation therefore was coveted by those that were so themselves. He made One often at the Meetings of the *Beaux Esprits*, and sate up Drinking and Laughing with 'em till Morning (*d*): Is it credible, that a Man of such Deformity could be so Acceptable, so Polite, and so Pleasant?

(*a*) Cic. in Catone. (*b*) Xen. in Symp. (*c*) Plat. in Conviv. (*d*) Ibid.

But of all things, that which ought most to prevail with us to pronounce him not-Ugly, is, that he was the greatest Lover of Beautiful Persons, and the most Belov'd by 'em of any of his Age: *Alcibiades*, *Critias*, *Agatho*, *Phædrus*, and the rest of his Acquaintances, were all remarkably Handsome: "so that if we "may guess him by his Companions and *Con-* "*tubernales*, we must needs believe him to be a "Comely person.

His Thoughts, his Discourses were all of Love; every thing he said and did tended to inspire people with it; his Philosophy was nothing but the Doctrine of Love: and can we think he would have dwelt upon this Passion so much, and inculcated it so often, if He himself had been so very Unlovely and Disagreeable?

Plato, and *Xenophon*, have wrote Set-apologies for him, wherein they defend him, among other things, from the Imputation of corrupting the Youth of *Athens* by Unlawful Love: had

had he been ſo deform'd, as he is ſaid to be, how could they better have clear'd him of it, than by Urging the Improbability of his attempting ſuch Impurities, in which he was ſo unlikely to prevail? But having ſaid nothing of this kind in his behalf, it muſt be preſum'd that they had nothing of this kind to ſay.

Ariſtophanes, who has expos'd and ridicul'd him upon twenty Other Accounts, has not a word, as I remember, of his Deformity; tho' this was the moſt Natural Subject for him to exerciſe his Comical Wit upon, and ſo Obvious, that, one would think, he could not have miſs'd it.

I appeal now to any Indifferent Judge, whether I have not prov'd *Socrates* handſome by as good Arguments at leaſt as our Critic has advanc'd to prove *Æſop* ſo? Indeed, they are moſt of 'em the very ſame; only urg'd further, and with more ſtrength (if I do not deceive my ſelf) in the Caſe of *Socrates*, than our Diſſertator has been able to carry 'em in relation to *Æſop*. And yet after all I have ſaid, I freely own, that the Teſtimony of any Ancient Writer concerning *Socrates*'s Uglineſs, tho' it ſtood Alone, and we had no Other to back it, would weigh more with Me than all theſe *Negative Authorities*. So weak an Argument is *the Silence and Prætermiſſion of never ſo many Authors* in a Point where any Single Writer of Note has plainly declar'd himſelf, and his Account has been generally receiv'd and credited by Succeeding Ages.

But

But I offend in dwelling ſo long on theſe Trifles, which deſerve rather to be Laugh'd at, than Confuted: I will trouble the Reader no further on this Argument than till I have ſuggeſted One Obſervation to him about Dr. *Bentley*'s odd Conduct in relation to *Æſop*. He is extreamly concern'd to have *Æſop* thought Handſome, at the time that he is endeavouring all he can to prove him no Author. He hopes by his Civilities to his Perſon to atone for the Injuries he does him in his Writings: which is juſt ſuch a Compliment to *Æſop*'s Memory, as it would be to Sir *William Davenant*'s, ſhould a man, in defiance of Common Fame, pretend to make out, that he had always a Good *Noſe* on his Face; but however, he did not write *Gondibert*.

Our Critic's Two Attempts are ſo very-inconſiſtent, that 'tis hard to imagine why a Man ſhould venture upon both of 'em at once: but Dr. *Bentley* had a good Reaſon for it, they were Both *Paradoxes*; and he cares not What, or Whom he writes for, or againſt, ſo he can but advance ſomething which no-body ever ventur'd to maintain before him; and which he is ſure always to manage at ſuch a rate, as that No-body will ever take it up after him.

I have done with what I intended to offer on Either of theſe Diſſertations; and, upon a Review of what I have ſaid, am aſham'd to ſee, to what a Bulk this trifling Diſpute has ſwoln. However, as Large as I have been upon it, I aſſure the Reader, that, unleſs I had ſpar'd Dr. *Bentley* very often, I muſt have been much Larger; for his Abſurdities are not yet near

near exhauſted. But I am not likely to be the Laſt whoſe Pen will be employ'd on this Subject; and 'tis fit therefore that Some Matter ſhould be left for Thoſe that come after me.

In that Diſſertation where I am chiefly concern'd, Dr. *Bentley* takes his Leave of the Argument, with Some particular Civilities to Me. He *heartily wiſhes he could do any Service to that Young Gentleman of great Hopes whoſe* NAME IS SET TO THE EDITION: *but he can do him no greater at preſent, than to remove ſome Blemiſhes from the Book that is* ASCRIB'D *to him; which he deſires may be taken aright, to be no diſparagement to Himſelf; but a Reproof only to his Teachers* (a). I would not willingly be behindhand with the Dr. in any Inſtance of Courteſie, and therefore, in return, will, e're we part, beſtow ſome Charitable Advice upon him: the rather, becauſe I have reaſon to believe, that he has very little Advice from any Other Quarter. If he had, he would certainly never have written on the Subject, in the Manner he has done: for I have not ſo ill Thoughts of any One Man I know in the World, as to imagin, that he would have adviſ'd Dr. *Bentley* to do as he has done, had His Opinion been ask'd in it. Young as I am therefore, I will take the freedom to do that kind Office to him, which his Friends, I find, either do not care, or are not allow'd to perform.

(a) Diſſer. p. 68.

And

And the firſt piece of Advice that I will venture to give the Dr. is, that he would know his own Talent; and reſolve for the future not to venture upon any way of writing that Nature never deſign'd him for. Wit, and Ridicule, are either the moſt Diverting, or the moſt Inſipid things in the World. I have the Opinion of good Judges, that he has no true Taſte of either of theſe, and performs very untowardly in 'em. He would do wiſely therefore to forbear 'em; and ſo he would, methinks, tho' he ſhould have ſome little Knack at 'em: for *Grimace*, and *Banter*, and *Quibbles*, even when luckily hit off, are not very ſuitable to the Character of a man in Holy Orders. And to give him my opinion what he is fit for, I think, (if he reſolves always to be doing ſomething out of his Profeſſion) that the Collecting Greek *Fragments*, or *Proverbs*, would be a proper Employment for him. He has ſucceeded well in One of theſe, and would doubtleſs be as happy in the Other: for his Genius ſeems to lye very ſtrongly that way; as one would gueſs by the Multitude of Proverbs in all Tongues, (Engliſh, Latin, and Greek, but chiefly in the Laſt) of which he has empty'd himſelf into theſe Diſſertations. And I am the rather apt to think, that ſuch Works as theſe might thrive in his hands, becauſe the well executing 'em depends chiefly on Two Qualities, which he muſt be allow'd to poſſeſs; Application, and a Willingneſs to be employ'd in ſuch Sorts of Studies

dies, as only load the Memory, without improving the Understanding.

It is Another piece of Advice I should chuse to give the Dr, that he would, against he writes next, make use of that Relation he has to a Court, so far, as to get a little Good Language, and Good Manners; without which, had he waded through all the Greek *Scholia*, and turn'd over every *Lexicon* extant, he would never write any thing that will either please or last. When he is making Reflections on Style, it is very proper, I think, that he should be well skill'd, not only in the Tongue he writes *of*, but in That too which he writes *in*: else, he will only make Sport for his Reader, if while he is correcting a Fault in One Language, he himself makes Ten New ones in another.

And till he understands his Own Tongue a little better than he does, he would do well to forbear Minting any New Words in it; which is the Work of Great Masters, and a Privilege allow'd only to Writers of the First Rate, who know the Compass of a Language, and see thro' all its several Beauties and Blemishes. Sir *William Temple* may say, *Sufficiency*, and the World will speak after him: Indeed we are convinc'd from some things that have come out a late, that there is such a mixture of Vanity, Indecency, and Ignorance, in some Mens Writings, as No One Word in our Tongue would perfectly answer; and there was need of a New one therefore to express it. But if Dr. *Bentley* should

ſhould take the ſame Liberty, he would be ſure to be oppos'd in it; His *Commentitious*, and *Puriſ*, and *Vernacular*, and *Negoce*, will be hiſs'd off the Stage, as ſoon as they come on: for the Fine Speakers will never endure that a man ſhould take upon him to coin New Words, who doesn't know how to uſe the Old ones.

Another thing I mightily recommend to him, is, that when he next pretends to fix the Age of Greek Words, and Phraſes, he would vouchſafe, among his other Greek Books, to read the *Bible:* leaſt he ſhould happen to pronounce Some Modes of Speech to be of Late Date, which are familiarly to be met with in thoſe Sacred Pages. For after all, ſhould his knowledge in Greek Learning prove never ſo great, yet it would not redound to his honour as a Divine, to appear well read in all Sorts of Books, but thoſe it beſt becomes him to be acquainted with, the Old and New Teſtament.

I am of Opinion too, that it would not be amiſs, if for this Twelvemonth next to come, he read over Dr. *Hody*'s *Vow* once every morning: 'tis a Good One; and thoſe who pretend to underſtand Secret Hiſtory tell us, it was made upon a very Proper Occaſion. I will inſert it here, both for Dr. *Bentley*'s Benefit, and Dr. *Hody*'s Honour; who, it muſt be own'd, has acted up to it always, as a right good-natur'd Man, and an Excellent Scholar.

Faxit

Faxit Numen,
Ut vel atquo Ego silentio inter non scribentes delitescam,
Vel semper, ut Virum Ingenuum liberalis ac generosæ
Educationis veræq; Philosophiæ studiosum *decet,*
Scribam:
Veritatis Unicæ Indagator,
Absq; omni Styli acerbitate,
Mitis, Urbanus, Candidus,
Ad id quod indecens est adeò non pronus, ut nec movendus:
Nugarum denique Contemptor.

In fine Præmon. ad *Adulalam.*

Next to this Short *Vow* of Dr. *Hody's*, I know no small Piece that will deserve his Reflections better, than *Lucian's Lexiphanes* (*a*). If he would read it often, take the good Advice that *Lucian* gives there, of *Sacrificing to the Graces, and to Perspicuity* (*b*); and suffer some Skilful Friend to administer to him the *Emetic Draughts* there prescrib'd, it would do him a World of Service: by the help of this Physick, and these Directions, well pursu'd, he might in time become a Sound Man again, and speak and write like the rest of his Neighbors.

(*a*) Lexiphanes *is the Name of a Famous Pedant, fond of Hard Words, and Affected Expressions.* Lucian, *in a Dialogue of his, gives a Vomit to him, and brings 'em all up, one after another. His Disease is excellently well describ'd by* Lucian *in these words;* Οὐκ ἀνθρώπου τὰ ῥήματα ἔλεγεν, ἀλλὰ τραγῳδοῦ τινος ἐκ μεγάλης τῆς τραπέζης ἀναβεβοημένου, ἢ ἀλεκτρυόνος ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδίων πτερύγων ἀλλομένου, ἢ ἵππου τὰ ὀδόντα συντρίβοντος, ἢ σκυθρωπὸν μισάνθρωπον ἐπὶ σκηνῆς, οὐ πάνυ τι ἀνθρώπινα συντιθέντος, ἢ τοιοῦτόν τινα ἐπιφαινομένου, ὃ μήτε ἐκ τῆς ξυνήθους, μήτε τὸ παράπαν ῥήματα τῆς φωνῆς ἀφιέντος. Luc. in Lexiph.

(*b*) μάλιστα δὲ θύειν τοῖς Χάρισι καὶ τῇ Σαφηνείᾳ. Id. ibid.

But

2. Whom Lucian meant perhaps Herodus Atticus.

But if he be too far gone in his Distemper to have a Thorough Cure made upon him, yet at least it is very possible, and very requisite, that he should advance so far towards it, as to purge his Style of all Insulting Unbecoming Terms, and Injurious Reflections: for if he carries on this Critical War in that Unsouldierly Way he hath hitherto done, and throws out his Rudenesses without Decency or Distinction, he may happen to draw some Inconveniences upon himself that he is not aware of.

Especially he should take care, when the Angry Fit is upon him, not to vent it upon *Great Bodies* of Learned Men. A Single Writer may be trampl'd upon now and then, and receive Correction from his Hand, without endeavouring to return it: but among Numbers, there will always be found Some, who have Ability, and Inclination, and Leisure enough to do Themselves and their Friends right upon the Injurer; tho' he were a Champion of ten times as much Strength and Prowess, as Dr. *Bentley* thinks himself to be. Besides, Single Adversaries dye, and drop off; but Societies are Immortal: their Resentments are sometimes deliver'd down from hand to hand; and when once they have begun with a man, there is no knowing when they will leave him.

'Twere well too, if he would think it a point of Prudence to observe some Measures of Decency towards the *Dead* as well as the Living, and not give himself that insufferable Liberty of attacking their Reputation and

their Works, in hopes that no-body will be generous enough to stand up in their behalf, and speak for those, who cannot speak for themselves. He has defy'd *Phalaris*, and us'd him very coursely, under the assurance, as he tells us, that *he is out of his Reach* *: Many of *Phalaris*'s Enemies thought the same thing; and repented of their Vain Confidence afterwards in his *Bull*. Dr. *Bentley* is perhaps by this time, or will suddenly be satisfied, that He also has presum'd a little too much upon his Distance: but 'twill be too late to Repent, when he begins to Bellow.

* Dissert. p. 40.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

P. 53, *l.* 18, *for* One of 'em was, *r.* Two of 'em were. *P.* 54, *l.* ult. First Inventor, *r. First Inventor*. *P.* 64, Ἀ δίξ, *r.* Ἀ. P. 66, in marg. ταῦτες, *r.* τοῦτες. *P.* 78 ϖεϖτικὸ, *r.* ϖεϖτικαί. *P.* 79, *l.* 12, this, *r.* his. *P.* 81, in marg. Gron. de Rec. *r.* Pec. *P.* 110, *l.* 32, a word of, *r.* a word of being kind to. *P.* 114, *l.* 2, Care, *r.* Cave. *P.* 136, *l.* 18, *d.* as he says. *P.* 139, *l.* 13, lit, *r.* hit. *ibid. l.* ult. *Phalaris*, *r.* the Letter-writer. *P.* 140, *l.* 1, He, *r. Phalaris*. *P.* 179, *l.* 15 ϖρόϖος, *r.* ϖτῶσις. *P.* 186, *l.* 21, fathom, *r.* fashion. *P.* 198, ξύλω, *r.* ζύλω. *P.* 212, *Nazgorgo* for *Naegeorgo*. P. 222, *l.* 3, Enclyticks, *r.* Enclitick. *P.* 272, *l.* ult. is, *r.* it.

A Short Account of

Dr BENTLEY,

By way of

INDEX.

DR Bentley's true Story *of the MS prov'd false by the testimonies of*

——— *Mr* Bennet. Pag. 6

——— *Mr* Gibson. p. 7

——— *Dr* King. p. 8

——— *Dr* Bentley. p. 19

Dr Bentley's *civil usage of Mr* Boyle. p. 10, p. 7 & 8. (in *Dr* King's *and Mr* Bennet's *Letters*) p. 199, 284.

His civil Language to

——— *Mr* Boyle. p. 11, 94, 238, 284.

——— *Sir* W. Temple. p. 94, 199, 200.

His Singular Humanity to

— *Mr* Boyle. p. 7, 9, 11

— *Sir* Edward Sherburne. p. 15, 16

— *Foreigners.* p. 14, 15

His Ingenuity in
— *relating matters of fact.* from p. 2, to p. 24
— *citing Authors.* p. 17, 18, 25, 26, 29, 117, 127, 132, 133, 150, 169, 212, 219.
— *transcribing and plundering Notes and Prefaces of*
— *Mr* Boyle. p. 35, 113, 114, 131, 143
— Vitzanius. From p. 54 to 60. 133, 193, 194
— Nevelet. p. 247, 248, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 269
— Camerarius. 273
— *Editor of* Hesychius. p. 156
— Salmasius. ibid.
— *Dr* Bentley. p. 192
His Appeal to Foreigners
—— *a suspicious Plea.* p. 13
—— *a false one.* p. 14, 15
His Charges against the Sophists return'd upon himself,
—— *for forging History.* p. 16, 117, 127
—— *for Solaecisms.* p. 34, 91, 178
—— *for egregious dulness.* p. 74, 106, 119, 135, 136, 137, 241
—— *for Pedantry.* from p. 93 to 98, 144, 216
—— *for declaiming.* p. 49, 50, 115, 116
His elegant Similes. p. 11, 94, 97
His clean and gentile Metaphors. p. 11, 97, 188
His nice taste
—— *in Wit.* p. 28
—— *in Stile and Language,*
—— *in Greek.* p. 60, to 73, 203, 208
—— *in Latin.* p. 34, 191, 206, 211
—— *in English.* p. 34, 185, to 192

His

His old Sayings and Proverbs. p. 11, 94, 116
His Collection of Asinine *Proverbs, with an addition.* p. 220
His extraordinary talent at Drollery. p. 36, 73, 117, 133, 214, 215
His choice of weighty points to debate. p. 156, 192
His exactness in Chronology. p. 118, 119, 140, 142, 165, 241, 243.
His familiar acquaintance with Books that he never saw. p. 76, 98, 115, 232
His respect to the Bible. p. 22, 62, 63, 67, 68, 121
His New Discoveries
— *of the* Buda *MS* p. 29, 30
— Empedocles's *Epic Poem.* p. 45. 195
His Old Discoveries
— *of* Ocellus Lucanus *being writ in Doric.* p. 54
— *of the* Æsopic *Fables transpros'd from* Babrias's *Scazons,* p. 248
His dogmatical air. p. 97
His modesty and decency in contradicting great men,
— Plato. p. 238
— Stobæus. p. 27
— Suidas. ibid.
— Fazellus. p. 32
— Capellus. ibid.
— *Mr* Selden. ibid.
— Grotius. — Scaliger. — *all the Moderns* } p. 158, 159
— Casaubon. p. 156, 158
— Erasmus. — Scaliger. } p. 236
— *Sir* W. Temp. p. 27. 92. 199
— *Mr* Barnes. p. 39. 40
— *Everybody.* p. 27. 226. 237

His

His boldness in confident assertions for want
— *of Reading*. p. 30. 31. 39. 40. 62. 63. 64.
63. 66. 67. 68. 85. 100. 101.
107. 116. 205. 206. 269
— *of Judgement*. p. 69. 74. 109. 110. 161.
182. 237
— *of Sincerity*. p. 76. 84. 111. 127. 132.
212. 214. 215
His surprizing Consequences, p. 52. 55. 59. 114. 115.
124. 185. 135. 136. 140. 144. 151. 158.
209. 210. 211. 232. 235. 236. 240. 241.
246. 253. 256. 257. 259. 273. 274. 277.
278. 279.
His profound Skill in Criticism. From begining to
The End.

Published
J. the 2d Tuesday in Feb.
1.

Mr Bennet Paris April 15
1[illegible]

I thank you for the care
you have taken of the Impression. Some
slight Mistakes I find are committed, and if
you think fit to make a 2d Edition of
my book, I desire they be rectified, & the
following alterations observed.

Your humble Servant,
R. Boyle

(p. 238. l. 8. for's Vor translated)
It is my Prayer to Heaven,
That my Name may never appear in the List of those
Or that I may always write as becomes a Person
of Sincerity & Liberal Education,
and a Lover of Sound & Useful knowledge;
A Searcher after Truth only,
Without any Affectation of Style,
Learned Vain Curious,
So far from being Disposed to any thing that is Indecent
as not to be provided to it.
In Short, a Despiser of Trifles.

Dr. BENTLEY's DISSERTATIONS ON THE *Epiſtles of* PHALARIS, AND THE Fables of ÆSOP, EXAMIN'D

By the Honourable

Charles Boyle, Eſq;

—— *Remember* Milo's *End*;
Wedg'd in that Timber which he ſtrove to rend.
Roſcom. Eſſ. of Tranſl. Verſ.

LONDON,
Printed for *Tho. Bennet*, at the *Half-moon* in St. *Paul's Church-yard*. 1698.

XUM

THE PREFACE.

SOON after *Dr.* Bentley's *Dissertation* came out, *I was call'd away into* Ireland, *to attend the Parliament there. The Publick Business, and my own private affairs, detain'd me a great while in that Kingdom, else the World should have had a much Earlier account of Him, and his Performance. For tho' He took above two Years to make his Learned Reflections on* Phalaris; *yet Two Months would have been enough to have shown him, that he is but a weak Champion in a very frivolous Cause.*

I speak not this out of any vain design of setting up for a Quick Writer, but meerly to avoid being thought to have thrown away any considerable part of my life upon so trifling a subject: which, as Idle a man as I am, is an Imputation I would not willingly lye under.

I little imagin'd ever to have been engag'd in a Dispute of this nature. I am not very fond of Controversies even where the Points debated are of some importance; but in trivial matters, and such as Mankind is not at all concern'd in, methinks they are unpardonable. This, ever since I came to have any Opinions of my own, has been one of 'em; and is still, tho' I am unluckily at present brought to act contrary to it. But the Case is this — Dr. Bentley *has been pleas'd, with some warmth, to fall foul on an Edition and Version of* Phalaris's Epistles,

that I some years since offer'd to the World. He has taken a great deal of Good-natur'd pains to prove, that I had been very foolishly busying my self upon a Contemptible and Spurious Author; and had made a bad book much worse by a very ill Edition of it. I was very Young, when I appear'd on that occasion; and I appear'd rather as one that wish'd well to Learning than profess'd it; and for both these reasons promis'd my self good usage from the men of more profound Skill in such matters. Dr. Bentley *was sensible that his Criticisms would lye under some disadvantage on this account; and therefore, to excuse his making so free with the Edition, was pleas'd to make yet freer with Me; and, according to His Breeding, to tell Me, and all the World, that I had set my name to a Book, which did not belong to me.*

The first of these Reflections, had it come single, I could easily have neglected: had he stop'd there, I would have left the Book to shift for it self, and Him to the good opinion he has of his own performances, without endeavouring to lessen it. But when he carried his Criticisms so far as to assert, not only of Phalaris, *but his* Editor *too, that they neither of 'em wrote what was ascrib'd to 'em; he gave me so plain, and so publick an Affront, that I could not, with any tolerable regard to my reputation, quietly put it up. Thus was I, much against my inclinations, brought into the Lists. It was necessary for me to say something in defence of my self; and when I did so, I thought it would be judg'd proper for me to say something too in defence of my Author; and to enquire into the justness of those Criticisms which Dr.* Bentley *has advanc'd on this occasion; and which, I foresaw, wou'd be look'd upon, as in some measure aim'd at Me, tho' they did not really belong to me.*

I have not any where in my Book asserted, that the Epistles, *which carry* Phalaris's *name, are Genuine; and I am not therefore engag'd to defend their Reputation against the Attacks of Dr.* Bentley, *or any other person, who, by the help of Leisure and Lexicons, shall set up for a Critic in this point. But as I have not undertaken for their being Genuine, so neither have I, with a decisive and assuming air, pronounc'd 'em Spurious. I expres'd my self with that Caution and Reserve in this matter, which I thought became a Young Writer, who was sensible, that the best and ablest Judges were divided in their opinions about it; and I thought it would be a very Indecent part in Me, to make my self a Judge between 'em.*

But I was chiefly induc'd to observe these measures, by the Regard I had for the most Accomplish'd Writer of the Age, *whom I never think of, without calling to mind those happy Lines of* Lucretius,

Quem Tu, Dea, Tempore in omni
Omnibus ornatum voluisti excellere rebus.

a Character, which, I dare say, Memmius *did not better deserve, than Sir* William Temple. *He had openly declar'd in favour of the Epistles: and the Nicety of his Taste was never, I think, disputed by Such as had any themselves. I quoted his Words with that respect which is due to ev'ry thing that comes from him: but must now beg his pardon for it; for I have by this means, I find, drawn him into a share of Dr.* Bentley's *displeasure: who has hereupon given himself the trouble of writing almost fourscore pages solemnly to disprove that One of Sir* William's *which he has prefix'd to his Dissertation; and which, to give him my opinion of his*

whole

whole Book at once, is the only good Page there.

I am therefore the rather inclin'd to give Dr. Bentley's *Reflections a Due Examination, on Sir* William Temple's *account; upon whom I so unhappily occasion'd this Storm of Criticism to fall. In truth, for a Man who has been so great an Ornament to Learning, he has had strange usage from Some who are Retainers to it. He had set the world a Pattern of mixing Wit with Reason, Sound Knowledge with Good Manners; and of making the one serve to recommend and set off the other; but his Copy has not been at all follow'd by those that have writ against him, in a very rough way, and without that Respect which was due both to His Character, and their Own.*

I will not pretend to determine, on which side, in those Disputes, the Truth lies; only thus much I will venture to say of 'em, that, let Sir W. T. be as much out in some of his Opinions as he's represented to be, yet They, who read both sides, will be apt to fall in with Tully's *Opinion of* Plato, *and say,* Cum Illo Ego mehercle errare malim quàm cum istis Scriptoribus vera sentire. *I had rather be so Handsomly mistaken as He is, if he be mistaken, than be so Rudely and Dully in the right, as Some of his Opposers, allowing 'em to be in the right, are.*

There was also another Consideration that determin'd me to write. Dr. Bentley's *Reflections were understrod to go further than either Sir* William Temple, *or my Self; and to be levell'd at a Learned Society, in which I had the happiness to be educated: and which Dr.* Bentley *is supposed to attack under those General Terms of* Our New Editors, Our Annotators, *and* Those Great Genius's with whom Learning, that is leaving the world, has taken up her last Residence.

By

By these, and such expressions as these, with which his Familiar Epistle abounds, he would insinuate as if Phalaris, *as slight a piece as it is, had been made up by contribution from several hands, and were the Joint Work of that Eminent Body. But in this he does me too great an honour; and I'm almost tempted to take it, as* Terence *did the agreeable Reproach of* Lælius *and* Scipio's *writing his Plays for him; neither to own nor deny it. But* Terence *wrote what might have become those Noble Pens; and therefore did no injury to their Reputation when he favour'd that mistake: whereas I shou'd be extreamly to blame, if I shou'd suffer a Report to spread to the disadvantage of so many Excellent Men. I think my self therefore oblig'd to declare, that whatever the Faults of* Phalaris *are, they are Mine; and I alone am answerable for them. There is a very Deserving Gentleman indeed, who had a little before been the Director of my Studies, and was then My Particular Friend, to whom I have acknowledgments to make on this occasion. I consulted him upon any difficulty, because I thought it not proper for one of my Age to offer any thing to the Public without consulting Some-body. I wish I had advis'd oftener with him, for then my Book would have been much more correct. But excepting Him, no one had a hand in it; nay, scarce a line was ever seen by any-body else as I know of, till it was finish'd. And now I have confess'd thus much, I don't care if I own a little further to Dr.* Bentley, *that I have been again oblig'd to the Same person for his Assistance in consulting some Books in the* Oxford Libraries *at my request, which in the Places where I have been, were not at all, or not easily, to be met with. The Dr. may make what advantages of this he thinks fit; I assure him, I will never recriminate;*

for

for I declare to the World, that I sincerely believe the Dr's Dissertation is entirely his own, both as to Matter and Dress; and that no Friend whatever, no not Mr. Wotton *himself, had any hand in it. The happy Genius of some Authors will for ever secure 'em from all Scandals of this nature:* Terence *indeed was suspected, but* Bavius *and* Mœvius *never were. Dr.* Bentley *has industriously contriv'd to lead his Reader into this mistake; imagining, I suppose, that the Conquest would have been too cheap for a man of his Rank in Letters, unless he engag'd, like the Hero of a Romance, with great numbers at once. But some men have thought themselves Heroes that were not, and some that were, have mistaken their Strength; and in either of these cases have come off but scurvily. The Dr, I'm sure, would have been made very sensible of this in the present Debate, had not I been kinder to him than He was to Himself, and stept in, as I thought it became me, between Him and the just resentments of that Learned Body. 'Twere pity that any of those worthy Men, who know so well how to employ their hours, should be diverted from the pursuit of Useful Knowledge, into such Trivial Enquiries as these. The Dispute began between Dr.* Bentley, *and Me; and 'tis fit that We Two should end it.*

I have a Request to Such as shall give themselves the Trouble of perusing These Papers, that they would do Me, *and Dr.* Bentley, *the Justice to compare 'em, Paragraph by Paragraph, with His Dissertations. The Task is a little unreasonable, considering the Length of the Dispute; but 'tis necessary, in order to form a true judgment of the Performance.*

Dr.

Dr. BENTLEY's Diſſertation UPON THE Epiſtles of *Phalaris*, &c. EXAMIN'D.

DR. *Bentley*, in the Piece I am about to examine, among ſeveral other Liberties, has taken this, of writing without any Method. Great Genius's indeed are above ordinary Rules: but it wou'd ill become ſo unknown a Writer as I am, to exempt my ſelf from 'em; and therefore I ſhall preſcribe my ſelf a method in anſwering him.

I think moſt of the ſcatter'd Remarks he has made, in that part of his Diſſertation which relates to *Phalaris*, will come under one of theſe Three Heads; They are either ſome *Arguments*, which he has urg'd for the *Spuriouſneſs* of the *Epiſtles*; or ſome *Faults* which he has found with my *Edition* and *Verſion* of 'em; or ſome *Matters of Fact*

which he has related, as the Grounds of his peeviſh Quarrel.

Theſe laſt he has thrown into an odd corner of his Book, as it were out of ſight; and plac'd 'em in the Rear of all his learned Arguments. One wou'd imagine, by the Poſt he has given 'em, that he diſtruſted their ſtrength, or that he wrote his Book firſt, and found Reaſons for it afterwards. However that may be, I think my ſelf oblig'd to clear up this Point in the firſt place, by ſetting thoſe *Matters of Fact* in their true light, which Dr. *Bentley* has extreamly diſguis'd: And then 'twill be time to conſider the *Wonderful Proofs* he has produc'd on his ſide, and the *Mighty Miſtakes* he has thought fit to charge me with.

About four or five Years ago, the worthy Dean of *Chriſtchurch*, Dr. *Aldrich*, (of whoſe College I was then a Member) deſir'd me to undertake an Edition of *Phalaris*. I cou'd deny Him nothing, to whom I ow'd ſo much; and therefore, as unfit as I thought my ſelf for ſuch a Task, I undertook it. In order to it, a Manuſcript *Phalaris* in the *King's Library* was to be conſulted. It was of no Age or Worth, I heard, being written but juſt before the reſtauration of Letters; however it was a Manuſcript, and therefore not to be neglected; eſpecially ſince we had no ancient Copies, either in *England*, or any where elſe, that I cou'd hear of. I ſent to Mr. *Bennet*, my Bookſeller in *London*, to get the Manuſcript, and deſir'd him to apply himſelf to Dr.

Dr. *Bentley*, in my name, for the use of it; not doubting in the least a ready complyance with such a request, from one of his Station and Order; and who besides was at that very time in a Lecture of some Honour and Profit that had lately been set up by one of my Family: especially, since the Book, which I desir'd to borrow, was of so little importance, that it had scarce been a Favour to have lent it me, if I had not ask'd it. After an Expectation of many months, Mr. *Bennet* sent me at last a Collation of part of the Manuscript, with this account; that he had, with a great difficulty, and after long delays, got the Manuscript into his hands; that he had it but a very few days, when Dr. *Bentley* came to demand it again; and won'd, by no means, be prevail'd upon to let him have the use of it any longer, tho' he told him, the Collation was not perfected: and that he deny'd this Request in a very rude manner, throwing out several slight and disparaging Expressions, both of me, and the Work I was about.

This I had reason to take very ill of Dr. *Bentley*, and therefore in that part of my *Preface*, where I gave an account of the MSS. that were consulted in that Edition, I inserted these words, [*Collatas etiam curavi usq; ad Epistolam 40 eum* MS° *in Bibliothecâ Regiâ; cujus mihi copiam ulteriorem Bibliothecarius, pro singulari suâ humanitate, negavit.*] which, considering the usage I had had from him, was as soft a thing as I cou'd well allow my self to say. The Epistles were no sooner publish'd, but Dr. *Bentley* sent me a Letter;

wherein, after expressing himself with great civility to me, he represented the Matter of Fact quite otherwise than I had heard it. I return'd him immediately as civil an Answer, to this effect: That Mr. *Bennet*, whom I employ'd to wait on him in my name, gave me such an account of his Reception, that I had reason to apprehend my self affronted; and, since I cou'd make no other excuse to my Reader, for not collating the King's MS. but because 'twas deny'd me, I thought I cou'd do no less than express some resentment of that Denial. That I shou'd be very much concern'd if Mr. *Bennet* had dealt so ill with me, as to mislead me in his accounts; and, if that appear'd, shou'd be ready to take some opportunity of begging his pardon: and, as I remember, I express'd my self so, that the Dr. might understand, I meant to give him satisfaction as publickly as I had injur'd him. Here the matter rested, and I thought Dr. *Bentley* was satisfied; especially since, I found, Mr. *Bennet* persisted in his account, and supported it with further proofs; and the Dr. seem'd willing to let the Dispute drop, by his not writing to me any further about it, or discoursing Mr. *Bennet* concerning it, to whom my Letter plainly refer'd him. In this Mistake was I, for Two Years and an half after the Edition of *Phalaris*; till at last Dr. *Bentley*'s Dissertation came out, and convinc'd me, that he had had Vengeance in his Heart all the time, and suspended his Blow only till he con'd strike, as he thought, to purpose. In this angry Discourse of his, he tells the World the same story (bating a Cir-

cumstanc

cumstance or two which he has alter'd) that he had told me before in his Letter. His words are these: *A Bookseller came to me in the name of the Editors, to beg the use of the Manuscript. It was not then in my custody: but as soon as I had the power of it, I went* P. 68. *voluntarily and offer'd it him, bidding him tell the Collator not to lose any time; for I was shortly to go out of Town for two Months. 'Twas deliver'd, us'd, and return'd: Not a word said by the Bearer, nor the least suspicion in me, that they had not finish'd the Collation.*

Startled at these Assertions thus reviv'd, after a long Silence, and improv'd in Print, I examin'd Mr. *Bennet* again very strictly and particularly. He assur'd me, that every word he had writ to me upon this occasion was punctually true; and that Dr. *Bentley*'s account, where it differ'd from his, was entirely false. He drew up the Matter of Fact in writing, and set his Hand to it; giving me liberty to make it publick, and to assure the World, that he was ready to justifie the truth of what he had written with his Oath, when it shou'd be duly requir'd of him. He added, that Mr. *Gibson*, the Collator, cou'd confirm some circumstances of his Account; and that his Brother (who was his Apprentice at that time, and was sent by him both to Dr. *Bentley*, and to the Collator) wou'd have attested the Truth of the Whole, had he been alive; but he dy'd some Months after this Matter happen'd. However, if his own Testimony, and the Collator's, shou'd be liable to Suspicion, yet still there was a Gentleman of known Credit in the World,

Dr. King *of the Commons*, who was witness to all that pass'd at one meeting, between him and Dr. *Bentley*; and wou'd, he hop'd, be so just to him as to give an account of it. He was not mistaken; for Dr. *King*, being apply'd to by a Friend of mine, presently wrote him the following Letter: which, together with the several Certificates of Mr. *Bennet* and Mr. *Gibson*, I here offer to the Reader.

WHereas the Reverend Dr. Bentley *has thought fit, in the* Appendix *to Mr.* Wotton's *Reflexions on Ancient and Modern Learning*, (p. 66, & 67.) *to insert the following words as Matter of Fact*; [*viz.* A Bookseller came to me in the name of the Editors, &c.] *I think my self oblig'd to give the World the following account, wherein I have faithfully related what passed on that occasion.*

See the Passage at length, p. 5.

I was imploy'd by the Honourable Mr. Boyle, *(and by him only) to borrow the MS. of* Phalaris *from Dr.* Bentley. *After about* Nine Months *solicitation, it was deliver'd into my custody, without any time limited for the return of it. Within* few days *after, Dr.* Bentley *call'd upon me, to have it restor'd, and Then told me, that he was to go into the Country. He staid till I sent to the Collator, and word was brought by the Messenger,* that it was not collated. *I then beg'd him to let me have it but till Sunday Morning, (it was Saturday Noon when he came) and I engag'd to oblige the Collator to sit up all Saturday Night, to get it finish'd. But he utterly refus'd to leave it with me any longer, demanding to have it sent that Day to* Westminster, *(which was done accordingly) and not giving me any the least hope, that*

that if I apply'd to him upon his return out of the Country, I ſhou'd have leave to get the Collation perfected. Theſe Circumſtances I am thus particular in, becauſe I had occaſion to recollect 'em not long afterwards, when Mr. Boyle's *Book came out, and Letters paſs'd between him and Dr.* Bentley, *concerning the Paſſage in his Preface.*

It may not be proper, conſidering my Imployment, for me to add an account of the Reflections Dr. Bentley *was pleas'd to make from time to time, when I ſpoke to him from Mr.* Boyle, *for the Uſe of the MS. He has repreſented me as having ſaid too much on that ſubject. But, by good fortune, Dr.* King *was preſent at one of the Meetings, and heard all that paſs'd there. I hope he will do Juſtice on this occaſion.*

July 13. 1697. Thomas Bennet.

I Very well remember, that Mr. Bennet *ſent his Man to me for* Phalaris's Epiſtles, *whilſt I was collating 'em; and being unwilling to part with them, before I had gone through 'em, I ſent the Man back without them. But he preſently return'd, and told me, that the Gentleman, that own'd them, ſtaid at their Shop for them, and cou'd not ſpare them any longer: This is the true reaſon, why I cou'd collate no more of the aboveſaid Epiſtles.*

Witneſs my Hand,

July 15. 1697. Geo. Gibſon.

SIR,

I *Am bound in Justice to answer your request, by endeavouring, as far as I can, to recollect what pass'd between Mr.* Bennet *and Dr.* Bentley, *concerning a MS. of the Epistles of* Phalaris. *I cannot be certain as to any other Particulars, than that, among other things, the Dr. said, that* if the MS. were collated, it wou'd be worth nothing for the future. *Which I took the more notice of, because I thought a MS. good for nothing, unless it were collated. The whole Discourse was manag'd with such Insolence, that after he was gone, I told Mr.* Bennet, *that he ought to send Mr.* Boyle *word of it: that, for my own part, (I said then what I think still) I did not believe that the Various Readings of any Book were so much worth, as that a Person of Mr.* Boyle's *Honour and Learning, shou'd be us'd so scurvily to obtain 'em. That scorn and contempt which I have naturally for Pride and Insolence, makes me remember that, which otherwise I might have forgot. Believe me, Sir, to be*

Your faithful Friend,

and humble Servant,

Doctors Commons, Octob. 13. 1697.

William King.

The Caſe then between me and Dr. *Bentley* ſtands thus. There is, on the one ſide, Dr. *Bently*'s ſingle Aſſertion, in his own cauſe; and theſe ſeveral concurring Accounts, from Perſons of Probity and Worth, on the other. The queſtion now is (if it be a queſtion) which of theſe ought to be credited; the Point to me is ſo clear, that I dare truſt the moſt partial Friend Dr. *Bentley* has to determine it.

Mr. *Bennet* and Mr. *Gibſon*, I think, are ſo little intereſted in this Diſpute, that they may be entirely depended upon. However, Dr. *King* is a Witneſs without Exception; and the account he gives of one of thoſe *Free Conferences* Dr. *Bentley* held with Mr. *Bennet*, is full and home; and I do aſſure our Learned Critic, that whatever becomes of *Phalaris*'s Letters, this of Dr. *King*'s is not ſpurious. I have the Original of it by me under his own hand, as I have the Originals too of the other Papers, which ſhall be at Dr. *Bentley*'s, or any man's ſervice, that pleaſes to command a ſight of 'em.

And now had I not reaſon to ſay what I did, and much more than I did, of Dr. *Bentley*, in my Preface to *Phalaris*? Cou'd I reſent the harſh Treatment he had given me in Gentler Terms than I there made uſe of? Since he had deny'd me ſo common a favour, and ſpoken of me with ſo much contempt, I was at Liberty, I think, to have return'd his Civilities in what way I pleas'd, and to have given him any Language whatever that it was not below me to give. And

that

struing Greek Words, as to tell us, that *Φεύγω* anciently signified to pursue, when that which fled fear'd and shunn'd the pursuer; and that it never signified to follow, in any other Sense; when *Hesychius* gives us no other words for *Φεύγω*, but *ἔτι, διώκω*, which are far from a Persecuting Sense?

Dr. *Bentley* is known to have liv'd in the same Age, and at the same Time, that the Edition of *Phalaris*, with which this Sophist is so angry, came out: it appears, from the Editor's Preface, that the Dr. being then Library-keeper at *St. James's*, deny'd a Common Favour to the Editor, which is complain'd of in that Preface: This doubtless gave occasion to our Sophist to forge these Dissertations in the Dr's name, to show his pretended resentments of that Complaint. Now the Dr. himself could not be ignorant, that this Edition was put forth by Mr. *Boyle*, whose Name it still bears. But Our Sophist, who liv'd at a greater distance from those Times, supposes it the Joynt-Work of several: he talks of *our Late Editors*, of *those Great Genius's*, *with whom Learning*, *that is leaving the World*, *has taken up her Last Residence*; of *these Annotators*, of our *Ingenious Translators* (a): whereas these *Editors*, *Genius's*, *Annotators*, *Translators*, could not but be known to one that then liv'd, and were known to Dr. *Bentley* (as appears by a MS Letter of his to Mr. *Boyle*, now in being) to be one and the same Person. It is true, that in the Preface to the Edition there are these Expressions, *Quantum scimus*, and *Nostro Labore*, and in the Dedication, *Tuâ ope adjutus*, which might lead our Sophist into a mistake, that

(a) Differt. p. 66, 71.

that this Edition was the Work of More than One; and that the Person, to whom it is dedicated, had assisted in it: as if it were unusual for the Plural Number to be put for the Singular; or as if a Person in that Station could no otherwise assist a Young Gentleman of his College in the Edition of a Book, than by collating Manuscripts, translating the Text, and writing Comments.

Dr. *Bentley* is known to have enjoy'd the advantage of a Public Lecture instituted by the Honourable Mr. *Robert Boyle*, and by reason of that Post must be supposed to have had a due respect for his Name and Family; so that it cannot rationally be presum'd, he would treat a Gentleman, who had the Honour to be nearly related to that Noble Person, with so much Contempt and Indignity, as is plainly express'd in several parts of that Dissertation.

Dr. *Bentley* did also flourish during the Life of Sir *William Temple*, whilst that Eminent Person was in great Reputation for the Signal and Extraordinary Services he had done for the Protestant Interest, to the English Nation, and to the King who then reign'd; as also for his Learned Writings, which were then in very great Esteem amongst all those who had a true relish for Sound Sense, and Noble Thoughts, express'd with all the Beauty and Force of proper and significant Language. Now tho' the Dr. might without any offence differ in his Sentiments from that Worthy Gentleman, yet it is not credible that a Scholar, a Courtier, and a Divine would so far break in upon all the Rules of Modesty, De-

cency, and Civility, as to insult over a Person of Sir *William*'s Character, and Merit, as an Ignorant and Illiterate Pretender to Learning; who *could neither discover the true Time, nor the true Value of his Authors; and whose Choice of* Phalaris *and* Æsop, *as then extant, for two great inimitable Originals, was a piece of Criticism of a peculiar Complexion, and must proceed from a Singularity of Palate and Judgment.*

"It must needs be a great Wonder to those "who think these Dissertations Genuine, "how or where they have been conceal'd; "and in what Secret Shop, or unknown Cor-"ner of the World they have lain hid, so "that no one has ever taken notice of 'em "for so many Ages. Had these Dissertations "been seen and read, somebody sure would "have quoted somewhat out of 'em; espe-"cially since so many have had occasion to
(a) Differ. p. 63. "do so (*a*): for all those who have written concerning Sophisms, and Ill Consequences in arguing, might have furnish'd themselves from hence with all Kinds of Loose and Incoherent Thinking. And those that have publish'd their Censures upon the Incongruities of Language, and Innovations in Speech, might from every Page of this Author have fetch'd proper Instances of the Grossest Improprieties. "So that, by their Silence and Prætermission,
(b) Differ. p. 64. "they do as good as declare expressly, that "they never saw our Dissertation (*b*).

But that which ought to weigh most with those who have any Honour for Dr. *Bentley*, toward clearing him from any suspicion of having written these Pieces, is this Consideration; that That Learned Doctor was chosen out

t by the then Fathers of the Church, as a
t person to vindicate the Truth of Religion
gainst Atheists, Deists, and all other Oppo-
rs of Divine Revelation: whereas this So-
hist is found to make use of such Argu-
ents (*a*) to disprove the Epistles of *Phalaris*,
are of Equal weight to prove the Writings
Moses and the New Testament to be of
uch Later date, than they can be consistent
with the Pretences of the Jewish and
hristian Religion. "So little regard had
this Bold Writer to fit his Discourses to
the Character of that Reverend and Lear-
ned Person; and I have had too much Re-
gard to Him, in giving him the Honour
and Patience of so Long an Examina-
tion (*b*).

(*a*) *Vide* p. 121st of his Book.

(*b*) Differ. p. 65.

Since

Since I have had the Patience to examine all the tedious *Proofs* Dr. *Bentley* has heap'd together against the *Epistles*, which I was not in the least concern'd to vindicate; I am oblig'd to say something to his *Criticisms* upon the *Editor* that relate entirely to my Self. I shall consider 'em with the same Indifference that I did his Arguments: for as I never profess'd my self a Patron of *Phalaris*, so neither was it ever in my Thoughts to set up for Exactness in that Dry Sort of Learning. I enter'd upon the Work merely as an Exercise of my Pen; I saw that Life and Smartness, which I still relish in these Epistles, quite lost in the Loose *Periphrasis*, and *plain Country Latin* (as the Dr. calls it) of the former Interpreters. This put me upon trying whether I could express the *Style* as well as the Sense of the Original in another Language; and represent it with such advantage, that They who are no Masters of Greek might see some faint resemblance of the Author's Spirit and Genius, in a Translation: in which whether I have been successful, and to what degree, must be left to the different Humors, and Opinions of Readers. I abhorr Vanity, and the more since I have read Dr. *Bentley*'s Book, where I see it makes so unbecoming a Figure: yet This I will be bold to say, that even in those Translations of the Greek Authors, which are esteem'd the Best, would a man of some know-

knowledge in Criticism exercise all the spite and skill he has that way to find out Mistakes, he might be able to muster up such a Plentiful number of 'em as would keep my Poor Version and Notes in Countenance. I question not but there are Errors and Oversights enow in my Translation: I was very Young when I did it; and, to confess the Truth, after I had got a little way into it, and made my first Essays, went thro' the Rest of it without my Great Gust: and 'tis no wonder therefore if I should not be awake sometimes in a Work that I was not very fond of. However, as Many, and as Easie to be found as my Faults are, Dr. *Bentley* has yet had the Ill Luck to miss 'em; and to except against such Passages as can, I think, to any Unprejudic'd Man, be fairly accounted for. The Town I own is Weak and Defenceless enough in conscience; but he has had the Judgment to attack it on that side, where perhaps it lies least expos'd. Upon *Scouring the first Epistle* (as he Cleanlily expresses himself) he finds these Words there, ψυχὴ δὲ ἀνοσοτάτου θάνατος, ἡ ἀνωμαλία &c. ἀσθενεῖ. Which, in my Latin, runs, [*Animi autem Morbum Medica Sanat Mors, Iram quidem nulli gravem*, &c. *expellit*]. He is pleas'd to render it thus, [*For a Disease of the Soul the only Physician is Death: do You therefore expect a most painful one*] and says, My Translation of ἀνωμαλία, [by *nulli gravem*] *produces a flat and far-fetch'd Sense* †. I must own I do not yet see why it is more *flat* to say a Villain shall dye an *Unlamented Death*, than that he shall dye a *Painful* one: and I as little apprehend why he calls this a *far-fetch'd* Sense;

† Dissert. p. 69.

Sense; I suppose he cannot mean by a *far-fetch'd* Sense, a Sense that the Word ἐπαχθὴς is not commonly us'd in, because I never could meet with it us'd in any other Sense, till Now he has thought fit to translate it *most painful*. All the Criticks before him render it by *non gravis*, *non invidiosus*, or by some word Equivalent to these: and *Hermogenes* thought this a proper sense of the word, when he intitul'd a Chapter περὶ τοῦ ἀπταίστως ἑαυτὸν ἐπαγαγεῖν; which I would advise the Dr. to read, not only to get a better acquaintance with the Word in question, but to learn too the modesty and discretion not to commend himself so often, with so very ill a Grace. I am sure he wants to be taught this; and since he has just now taught me what I knew nothing of before, I could do no less than make him this Grateful Return.

He goes on to instruct me. *The Greek*, says he, *is in the Superlative degree, let 'em put it then*, nulli gravissimam, *and I will shew 'em the Error of their Version* †; that is, let Me translate it for 'em, and I'll undertake to make neither Grammar nor Sense of it. But if he will give me leave to translate it my self, since it must be in the Superlative degree, instead of *nulli gravem*, I would put *minimè invidiosam*; and then I do not yet see any Error in the Version: and I am the more inclin'd to think there's none, because the Dr. slides off, and takes Refuge in his Strong and Secret Hold, the MSS. *The MS*, he says, *reads it* ὡς ἐπαχθέστατον; *and They* (as he calls *Me*) *might have embrac'd this Reading, when they saw it there.* What MS. is this? None of the *Body-MSS* read it so; nor

† Dissert. p. 69.

nor the *Arundel*, a Collation of which the learned *Dean of York* sent me, after my Edition was finish'd. Sure the Dr. cannot mean the *King's MS*; he knows I never saw That my self; and I hope I am not answerable for my Collator's Eyes. And, since No-body can see it but Dr. *Bentley*, I have no great Reason to depend upon His Ingennity. However, if this be the Reading of the King's MS, 'tis frivolous and fit to be neglected: for to Me the Common Reading seems to have rather a *Quicker Sense*, and (having shewn Dr. *Bentley* to be no great Master in Propriety of Speech) I may venture to say, as much *Propriety*. Perhaps the Dr. might have thought so too, but that he has a Peculiar Fondness for the *Paraplerematick Particle* ἀν, which he takes to be *a rare and quaint usage* (*a*): and having met with it Here therefore, is resolv'd not to part with it. To diminish his fondness for it, I promise to furnish him upon demand with 30 or 40 Instances from *Homer*, and the *Greek Testament* (to go no further), where *the Particle* ἀν is us'd as *Paraplerematically* every whit as it would be here, should his Reading prevail.

(*a*) Differ. p. 70.

But to wave entring into a Controversie with him about Particles; let us see whether he be not as Exquisite a Judge in *Latin* as he is in *Greek*: He charges me with *Barbarism*, *Nonsense*, and *New Discoveries* in Language for translating *Scelera non invita*; for he is very positive that *Invitus always* means the Agent, is *always* spoken of the Person, *never* of the Thing, &c. But I hope *Propertius*, who liv'd in the Purest Age of Latin,

tin, may be presum'd to understand his own Tongue as well as Dr. *Bentley*: He (*El.* 16. *L.* 1.) expostulating with an Unkind Mistress, says, that tho' she was Cruel and Unrelenting, yet if she did but hear his Complaint,

Non — ipsa suos poterit compescere Ocellos:
Surget & invitis spiritus in Lachrymis.

Is *Invitis* here joyn'd with the *Person* or the *Thing*? if *Propertius* had said, as he does in other places, that Tears would flow *ab Invitis Oculis*; tho' an Eye be improperly call'd a *Person*, yet in that case I might allow it to be taken *Personally*: or had he attributed any *Action* to Tears; as, if he had said, *invita surgent Lacryma*, *Lacryma* might be consider'd as an *Agent*: but as it stands here, *Invita Lacryma* must be render'd *Involuntary Tears*; and to explain it otherwise is, I think, contrary to Good Sense and Good Language too. Were Dr. *Bentley* as well acquainted with the Latin of the Great Men in *Augustus*'s Age, as with that of the Pedants in This, he would have another Taste, and another Style: To know the Grammar of a Tongue, and to have a just sense of the Proprieties and Elegancies of it, are two different things; as different almost as Construing *Euclid*'s Words, and being Master of his Demonstrations. Any-body that will take the pains may be Critically exact in the Signification and Syntax of Words; but to enter into the Spirit and Beauty of good writing is an Happiness that None have but those who are Born with it; nor All of them neither: for a Long Conver-

sation

tion with Bad books may destroy a good Natural Taste. I don't say, this is Dr. *Bentley's* case, for I am not a Judge whether he ever had any.

To come a little nearer to his Ages of Latin, I will give him a Couple of Instances of the same kind out of *Statius*; One of them from the 9th *Thebais*, where Young *Dryas*, after he was mortally wounded, sends this Message to his Mother,

—— Merui, Genetrix, pœnas; invita capessens
Arma Puer rapui, nec Te retinente quievi. v. 891.

Invita is here apply'd not to the *Person* his Mother, but to the *Thing* Arms taken up against her Will. In the 7th *Thebais* the *Greeks* are encourag'd by *Jupiter* to make a furious assault upon *Thebes*; and *Bacchus* in his Speech to *Jupiter* on this occasion, says,

Esto olim invitum *jaculatus nubibus ignem;*
Credimus: in iterum ultra refers incendia terræ,
Nec Styge juratus, nec Pelicis Arte rogatus?
v. 158.

Jupiter, by his Vow to *Semele*, was oblig'd, against his own Inclination, to grant what he ask'd: and therefore the destruction he brought upon her was *Involuntary*: I think *Invitum* can bear no other sense here, and I therefore leave these Passages with Dr. *Bentley* to consider at his Leisure; Let him try his Skill upon 'em next time the angry Fit of Criticism returns.

I see there is no way of pleasing an Incens'd

cens'd Dissertator; I have just clear'd my self from the Imputation of using a Word in a *different* sense from other Writers; and now he accuses me for using a Word in the *same* sense with all the Authors that ever writ. I translate παρορίτην *Hortaris*, which I interpret by *Provocas*, as *Budæus* does; who in his Learned Commentary has these words, παροτρύνῃ, *provocant, cient*; *& usus est satis frequens*: and I translate it so, because I could find no other Signification of it in any Greek Writer; and Dr. *Bentley* himself owns as much, that it is not otherwise us'd by *any of the Ancients*. Now I never designing to make a Noise with the Corrections and Improvements of Old Vocabularies, was contented to use words in the same Sense that every-body had us'd 'em before me; and for this Error of mine my Indictment runs, that I am *an Illiterate Fatherer of an absurd, ridiculous, and incongruous Sense upon my Author*. My Plea is, that it seems to Me no more absurd, or ridiculous, that *Phalaris* should say to one of his Enemies, *You provoke me to be cruel*, than that he should say (as Dr. *Bentley* would have him) *You upbraid me with Cruelty*. And I believe his Cavil against the *Syntax* of ἐ ἰμοὶ παρορίτην is no better grounded than that against the *Sense*. He won't indeed find παρορίτην in his Grammar with a Dative Case, but *he may please to inlarge it from this very place* *: and as for his ἐς ἐ, or ἐφ' ἐ, we have no occasion for either of 'em: in the days of *Sophocles* ταῦτ' ἐ π παρορίτην was no more absurd and incongruous than *Quæ me hortaris* was in *Tully's*. But Dr. *Bentley* thinks he *has shewn already, that* παρορίτην *signifies*

* Dissert. p. 75.

ωρίζειν *to reproach* *; where has he shewn it? he has no where said any thing of it, but in the 52d page; and there he only says, that ἐγκαλέω, *to accuse, is an Innovation in Language, for which the Ancients us'd* ὀνειδίζω: so that positively to averr, and assume the thing in question is in his Language to *shew*, and prove it. Let us see now whether his Second Thoughts furnish him with any better proof of ὀνειδίζειν signifying to *accuse*. One would expect that he should produce the Authority of some Greek Author, that uses ὀνειδίζειν in this sense: but he has given this argument quite another turn, and proves, that 'tis us'd so here, *because 'tis never us'd so by any ancient Author before the Sophist* †; he might have added too, nor by any Modern Author since. This is a surprizing way of arguing, but I find it familiar, to Dr. *Bentley*; he has another just of this strain in the 115th page: he says there, *One may know* Sabirius Pollo *to be a Roman*; how so? does he find any such Family among the *Romans?* no, that's too Obvious a Way of arguing for a man of his Parts: he knows him to be a *Roman*, because he *does not find such a Family as the* Sabirii, *or such a Surname as* Pollo: and he improves this Acquaintance with *Sabirius* so far, that within Three pages he calls him *his Friend Sabirius Pollo*. Such are the New Ways of Reasoning made use of by this Incomprehensible Author: He has furnish'd us with several; and, to shew that he is not yet exhausted, he brings This argument to prove that ὀνειδίζειν signifies to *reproach*: ὀνειδίζειν and *vitio vertere* signifie *to reproach*; therefore ὀνειδίζειν does so too: and

* Differt. p. 72.

† Ibid. p. 72.

in the same Paragraph, he after the same manner makes it out, that διατείνω is to *persevere*; is not διατείνω *exactly the same with* pertendo? (meaning, I suppose, that διὰ is *per*, and τείνω *tendo*) *and is not* pertendo *to persevere?* I always thought that *Use* was the only Rule and Measure of the Signification of words; but Dr. *Bentley*, a great Adventurer in new ways of thinking, will determine it by dint of Argument. Would he allow Others to argue as He does, from One Compound Word to Another, and from One Language to Another, we might *enlarge our Dictionaries* without End; and soon produce not only (what he pretends to *) *five thousand*, but five Millions of Emendations and Additions to *Hesychius*; tho' not Such as are worthy to keep Company with the Admirable Bishop *Pearson*'s Observations on that Author: and therefore should they hereafter come together (as 'tis said they will); and should the *Bishop*'s Name not happen to be set to His part (as 'tis possible it may not); it will be no difficult matter to distinguish between 'em. According to the Dr's Rule (not to go far from the words he plays with) because διαφέρω signifies *to differ*, therefore *by a Like Metaphor, and Analogy, we may use* διατείνω *to express the same notion* †: And thus again I can prove, that *præverto* is to *exhort*; for is not *præverto* exactly the same as παρατείνω? and is not παρατείνω to exhort? or that διήκω is to *persevere*; for is not διήκω exactly the same with *persisto*? and is not *persisto*, to *persevere*? So that for ought I can see, it must be allow'd, either that all words may be us'd e'en as we please,

* Epistola in fine Malalæ, p. 39.

† Differt. p. 73.

or

or else that προτρέπω must signifie, as it has done for above Two thousand years, *hortari*; that is, not always to *Exhort*, (a Word he makes such wretched Mirth with) but to *excite* by any other methods: unless when *Virgil* says, *Jam Vitulos hortare*; and *Ovid*, *Hortatur*, *Canes*, they mean, that *Dogs* and *Bullocks* are to be made tractable by good Advice and Exhortation.

If our Critic is unalterably determin'd, that the Sense of this Passage must be [*the Crimes which You* upbraid *me with*] why should he not chuse rather to read προτρέπεις than ἀποτρέπεις? for tho' I no more know an Instance of ἀποτρέπω than of προτρέπω's being us'd for ἀναιτιάζω, yet the Formation of the Word will more easily and naturally allow of this use: ἃ ἐμοὶ προτρέπεις may well enough signifie, *quæ mihi vitio vertis*; but ἀποτρέπεις, in that sense, is, I think, a very *improper* and unnatural *Innovation in Language*.

One would wonder that Dr. *Bentley* should be so eager in imputing this Mistake to my Translation, which he is so little capable of making out; but he had a double End in it: My Explication of the Word offended him so much the more, because it spoilt an Argument that He urges, to prove the Epistles Spurious: I shall draw it up in short, but in its full force and strength; and leave it to the Consideration of the Reader. Προτρέπω *was never us'd for* ἀναιτιάζω *in any ancient Author before the Epistles, nor by any modern Author since the Epistles; nor in the Epistles themselves*: therefore *the Epistles are Spurious*. This Weighty Point is shut up with a Piece of His-

ſtory, that is worſe founded than his Criticiſm; and proceeds from Something which was always thought a greater Blemiſh to a Divine, than want of Judgment. He ſays, *The Edition aſcrib'd to* Cujacius, *and another of* Aldus, *tho' the Two Principal of All, and Both of 'em in the Public Library at* Oxon, *had yet the Odd Fortune to lye all the while conceal'd from our Late Editors that liv'd there* (*a*). I am at a Loſs how to deal with a man of this Extraordinary Confidence, that can ſo boldly aſſert what 'tis impoſſible he ſhould know. What ſhall I ſay to One, who will face me down, that I never ſaw, what I know my ſelf to have often ſeen and us'd? nay, and will prove this to me out of my own Preface? the place he quotes is this, *Codices Impreſſos quatuor pra manibus habui qui eodem plane Textu utuntur; apud quos Verſiones ſunt duæ, altera à* Naogorgo, *altera in* Uſum Schol. Soc. Jeſ. *edita* (*b*). Two of the Four Books I here particularly mention'd, how does he know but thoſe he mentions are the Other Two I mean? as indeed they are. I had no occaſion to name 'em, becauſe I found little Difference in 'em from thoſe which I had in my Own Study: the Verſion aſcrib'd to *Cujacius*, is exactly the ſame with That, put out for the *Schools of the Jeſuites*, which I have expreſly ſaid I made uſe of. A man of any Candour and Fairneſs, or indeed of any Common Modeſty, would not have preſum'd, upon ſo ſlight Grounds, ſo poſitively to aſſert, that I had overlook'd what lay ſo plainly in my way: but I am the leſs ſurpriz'd to hear this from Dr. *Bentley*, who would fain perſwade me that I never ſaw my Own Edition. In

(*a*) Diſſer. p. 73.

(*b*) *Vide* Præf. p. 3.

In the Body of this Dissertation there are Two other Mistakes, which the Dr. has found in my Version: I took no notice of 'em where they lay; but, to avoid Confusion, reserv'd 'em for this place. The First is, my rendring πηλίνων Θηκαλίων, *poculorum Vitreorum*, as *Suidas*, *Etymologicon Magnum*, and *Favorinus* had done before me. These are Eminent Names in that Sort of Learning, which Dr. *Bentley* seems best acquainted with, and most to value himself upon; and therefore, one would think, should be able to excuse me with him: but his Maxim is, to value nothing any further than it is to his purpose. When *Suidas* is brought in for preserving some few Fragments of *Babrius* *, then he is a man that converses with *Writers of Size and Quality*: but when he is produc'd for that, *which will leave us not the least Footstep of our Corinthian Potter* (*a*), and *whereby the argument about* Thericles *would vanish into nothing* (*b*); then he is a trifling Scribler, his Lexicon consists of *Excerpta from Scholiasts and Glossaries* (*c*). If once he begins to quarrel thus with his Good Friends the Lexicographers, I can expect no mercy from him: But I would ask him, why he says that in the *particular passage before us neither the Use of Language nor Good Sense will allow* Θηρίκλεια ποτήρια to be translated *Glasses*? When *Phalaris* is said to send *Cups of Gold and Silver*, and besides † *Ten Couple* Θηρικλείων ποτήρων, to me it seems agreeable to *Good Sense*, that these Cups, which are here distinguish'd from Cups of Gold and

* Dissert. p. 140.

(*a*) Ibid. p. 27.

(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) Ibid.

† Ἀπέπεμψε δὲ ζεύγη φιάλας ἀπὸ χρυσοῦ πίνακας, καὶ κρατῆρας ἀργυροῦς· ἃ δὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς πίχεις δύο, καὶ ποτήρων Θηρικλείων ζεύγη δέκα. Ep. 70.

Silver, ſhould not be as Dr. *Bentley conceives*, *Silver at leaſt, if not of a more precious Metal*: unleſs there be ſome other Metal, beſides Gold, more precious than Silver. He may be as Merry upon theſe Glaſſes as he pleaſes, and call 'em *Odd and Stingy Preſents*, *Cheap and Brittle Compliments*; I am not anſwerable for *Phalaris*'s Generoſity. Beſides I freely own my ſelf Ignorant how cheap Glaſſes were in *Sicily* two thouſand Years ago; for ought I know, they might be Great Rarities, and fit to bear the Reſt of his Preſents Company; eſpecially being of ſo Vaſt a Size as they appear to have been, and ſent in ſo much greater Number than the Other Preſents were: for the Epiſtle tells us, there were but *Two* Cups of Silver, and *Four* of Gold; and *Ten Couple* of thoſe of *Thericles*. From whence one would be apt to conclude, that they were of a *Baſer*, and *not of a more Precious Metal than Silver and Gold*, as the Dr. imagines. I can bear all his Raillery upon *Phalaris* here for a *Stingy* Preſent: but why is he offended with Me too for a *Preſent* I never deſign'd him? He ſays I have preſented him with an Emendation of *Poculorum Vitreorum*, whereas the former Interpreters honeſtly tranſlated it, *Thericlean Cups*. But I muſt put the Dr. in mind to quote thoſe *Honeſt Tranſlators* honeſtly: he knows One of the Two tranſlates it *Poculorum Vitreorum*, as I do; I mean *Cujacius* (or whoever elſe be the Author of that Verſion aſcrib'd to him) whom the Dr. is pleas'd to ſay, I never ſaw.

With the ſame Sincerity he tells me, that whereas I have render'd [illegible], *in marg.* [illegible]

arundinis (*a*); the Translation in the former Editions was, *instar pinûs* (*b*). Here again I have follow'd the Version, which he advises me to consult in my next Edition (*c*), the Version of *Cujacius*, which has it, *in morem arundinis*: and this I did, because I thought it would be a greater piece of justice to my Author, to make the Passage in him Clear and Intelligible, than to translate a Greek Proverb Literally, which would have been no Proverb in Latin. Dr. *Bentley* would probably have interpreted it Literally, on purpose to have had an occasion of explaining it; I could have done so too, and have cramm'd a Page of *Erasmus* into my Notes, as He has here into his Dissertation: but I am glad I translated it as I did; for 'tis pity the Dr. should have wanted an Opportunity of shewing how excessively Witty he could be upon this Proverb. Ἐκριζῶ αὐτὸς ὥσπερ πίτυν, says *Phalaris*, *I will extirpate them like a Pine-Tree*; and this Tree (according to the Dr's Natural History) *perishes by Lopping*. He takes this Hint to tell me, that I have *lopp'd off a Branch of his Evidence* (*a*), that I have *executed this Proverb upon it self, and extirpated the Pine-Tree out of my New Version* (*a*); that I have *rooted up the Pine-Tree, and transplanted Reeds* (*a*) thither: which he *confesses is above his Small Understanding in Gardening* (*a*). What a Deluge of Wit is here! all these fine things are said within the Compass of half a Page: who can resist a Writer, that thus takes care, that his Fancy shall still keep pace with his Judgment; and that the One shall not Instruct You more than the Other Entertains

(*a*) Ep. 91.
(*b*) Differ. p. 29.
(*c*) Ibid. p. 75.
(*a*) P. 29, 30.

You? However, after he has refresh'd himself a little, he must give me leave to tell him, that his *Understanding in Gardening* is indeed very *Small* (as small as his Knowledge in Natural History) if he thinks that it has any thing to do either with *Reeds* or *Pines*; which, I take it, grow as rarely in Gardens as *Mushrooms* arise out of *Rotten Passages in Authors*. Dr. *Bentley* must indeed be allow'd to understand Some parts of Gardening very well; particularly *Transplanting* and *Weeding*: The First of these he has prov'd his Skill in by those Few Notions that are worth any thing in his Piece; for they are *transplanted* from Other Mens Prefaces, the Nurseries of all his Critical Learning: His Skill in the Second is made out by all the Rest of his Appendix; which is nothing else but a Collection of Ill *Weeds*, pull'd up out of Good Writers. There is, I remember, a Passage in *Athenæus*, where this Happy Talent of *Weeding Authors* is very well express'd: I shall give it the Learned Reader, together with three or four Lines that introduce it; because it is, all together, one of the Shortest and Liveliest Accounts I have met with of a Man possess'd with the Spirit of Criticism. Οὐδὲν ἄλλο σὺ ἴσθα, says *Cynulcus* to *Ulpian*, ὦ λόγων δυσχερῶν σώων, εἰ ἱστορίας μανθάνω, ἢ τῆς ἐν λέξεσι χάριτος ἀπέχεσθαί ποτε: ἀλλὰ χείρων ἀκούσῃ σὺ ταῦτα κατατρίβων ξητῶν, κᾶ, ἢ κᾶ (*); εἶρε, εἰ εἶρε; of *Athenæus*, at the very entrance, tells us, this *Ulpian* was such an insufferable Pedant, that he would neither Eat nor Drink any thing, till he had ask'd the Questions κᾶ, ἢ κᾶ? and satisfied himself in what Greek Author the Word, by which it was call'd, was to be found; from whence, he says, he got the Name of Κατάκεκρυφος: which I desire Dr. *Bentley* may be added to *Chlonthacbonthlus*, as a Like Instance of the Name of a man but *once* mention'd in old Authors.

(*) The Epitomizer

ἐξορυ-

ψυχίζειν τὰ μὴ ἀρεσκόντα τῶν συνδειπνούντων ὡς ἀνήθους συνόντων,

Ὡς δὲ Ἐχενεῖδης, ἐξ ἀπὸ τριχῶν Ὄνους ἢ διατριβῶν, Ἀθήνας δὴ ἐδίζων ἐδὲ συνοικεῖν]

L. 3, *C.* 17. A Character, which will fit the *Ulpians* of Our Time, as well as those of *Athenæus*'s; for the Race of 'em is not yet extinguish'd.

I have follow'd our Dissertator thro' a long Scene of Impertinence; and am come at last to That Part, where he places his greatest Strength; that is indeed, the most Trivial Part of all, the MSS. I told the Reader in my Preface, that I only made use of such different Readings in the MSS, as conduc'd to the better understanding the Text; for I always thought it a Ridiculous piece of Pedantry to load a book with Various Lections to no purpose: but this I find Dr. *Bentley* calls *Skill in using MSS.* He and I differ in our Notions about these matters; and I hope we always shall.

In the 64th Epistle, the Printed Copies read ἐγὼ γ' ἐδόκουν ἔδη φεύγω πάντας ἀνθρώπους· I saw the MSS here had a Various Reading ἐδὲ for ἔδη, which I pass'd over with that Contempt it deserv'd, and guess'd it should be ἐπαινέτην; a Reading, that with a very small Alteration made my Author speak Sense: Let us see, what Dr. *Bentley*, and his MSS make of it. *Phalaris* says, τοῦ ἐδὲ τοῖς ἀναγκαιοτάτοις ἐμοῦ· ἐγὼ γ' ἐδόκουν ἔδη φεύγω πάντας ἀνθρώπους· πάντα γὰρ ἔστι πᾶς ἄλλος πλὴν, ἔτ' ἐν φίλοις βεβαίως ὤν· Which I would render thus, *I am not so much as seen by my Nearest Relations; and I*

now

now the more carefully avoid mankind, because I have found no Faith nor Truth, not only among Other Persons, but even among my Friends themselves. Dr. *Bentley* says, we must take ἤδη here for a *certain Correction*. But since the Tyrant is giving a reason for his *present* Recluse way of Living in opposition to his *former* freedom and openness, methinks ἤδη can't well be spar'd here. Besides [*I avoid all mankind less than I ought to do*] seems to Me a very improper expression; especially after a Man has said, that he avoided all mankind to such a Degree as *not to be seen by his Nearest Relations*, would he add immediately, that he avoided Company less than he ought to do? What would Dr. *Bentley* have him do more? or how can a Man be more retir'd than by seeing no-body? I desire the Dr. to have Some Regard to Sense, as well as to MSS.

This ἐνδέκατον returns agen in the 68th Epistle, ἐμαυτὸν ἐν δέκατον ἐγκλείσας τῶν κακῶν, ἐκφεύγω. *Now here too*, he says, *Every one of the MSS have it* ἤδη. As for the King's MS, no body knows what it has, or has not; and this Epistle is wanting in one of the *Badly* MSS: so that all these MSS that I have overlook'd prove at last to be but One; in which perhaps I might not observe this Various Reading. But if I had observ'd it, I think I should scarce have made use of it; for if we put ἤδη in the room of ἕνδεκα, ἐνδέκατον must be an Adverb, and referr'd to ἐκφεύγω: and the Rules of good Language will hardly allow, that the Adverb should be joyn'd in Place to

one

me Verb, and in Sense to another, at such a stance: not to insist on the Ambiguity that rises from its Neighborhood to ἐμαυτὸν, to which it seems to be naturally joyn'd as an djective; and 'tis with some difficulty, that e bring our selves to understand it otherwise, even after the Correction of ἐν into ἐμ allow'd to prevail. Had the Author intended *instrumm* for an Adverb, he would probably have put it after ἐμαυτὸν, and not before . I am so us'd to Dr. *Bentley*'s Language, hat I can easily bear his telling me here, that *I make meer Nonsense of the Context*: whether I o or no, must be left to those who will take he trouble of considering it. Indeed such a air and ingenuous Translator as Dr. *Bentley*, hat renders ὅσα τὰ παρὰ σοῦ, *what I want Money to give*, may make Nonsense of any hing.

There is yet one Instance more of Unskilulness that he charges upon me, *Stardous is de o*, I translate, *perpendens suam Conditionem, onsidering the Circumstances he is in*, as *Nuncupius* had translated it before me; the Dr. renders it, *perstitens in proposito, proceeding in is present ways*, according to *Cujacius*: neither of us produce any Instances of our Use of he word *Stardous*, nor pretend to do it; we re meerly upon the Guess, what it must signifie, by its relation to the Sentence; and which of us guesses best, is to be determin'd by our Readers. Had I been never so much out, he might have taken a more Courtly way of letting me know it, than by saying, that *Leucon carries one thing, and his Ass another*; that is, the Writer of the Greek Epistle means

means differently from the *Asi* his Editor: This is such a Compliment as there is but one Proper Way of Returning; Gentlemen do not use to resent such Language with their Pens only. But I forgive him; 'tis a Mode of Speech familiar to him, I find, and which he bestows on every one he has to deal with. In the 11th page, the Sophist is *an Asi under the Skin of a Lyon*; in the 59th, *Phalaris* himself is *a meer Asinus ad Lyram*. Since he is so fond of *Asinine Proverbs*, I will throw him in One out of *Aristophanes*, to compleat his Collection. It is, Ὄνος ἄγων μυστήρια; upon which *Erasmus* has this Remarkable Gloss; *Asinus portans Mysteria, in eos dicebatur qui præter dignitatem in Munere quopiam versantur; velut si quis ignarus literarum Bibliothecæ præficeretur:* in English thus, *The Proverb of* an Ass carrying Mysteries *was apply'd to Those who were preferr'd to some Place they did not deserve, as when a Dunce was made a Library-keeper.* And if that *Library-keeper* should so far mistake his Office, as to think he was put there, not to shew Books to Gentlemen that came to see 'em, but to keep the Door shut, he would be still more unfit for the Place. I have had Worse Treatment than this from Dr. *Bentley*: for he has not only deny'd my Collator the use of the King's MS, but dealt with me all-along, as if I had seen it, and us'd it my self; once before, in the case of ἐνδεέστερον ἢ δεῖ, and here agen in relation to διατείνων. Having no Authorities to countenance my Version of διατείνων by *expendens*, I laid hold of a different Reading in the King's MS, sent me by my Collator, where he assur'd me it was διὰ πάντων.

Dr.

Dr. *Bentley* puts on his Critical Spectacles, and finds, that tho' it be διὰ τοῦτον now, it was originally διατούτων; and that the ν has been *eras'd* by a modern hand, *as appears by a Void Space*: and upon this he triumphs over my Skill in perusing the MS, when he knows it was fifty miles off of me, all the Time of the Edition. What *Void Spaces* now *appear* in that MS, how many *Erasings* there are, or by what *Hand*, is matters not much to dispute or enquire. Nown I overlook'd the *false accenting* of these words, which he charges me with: but to set down my translation of διὰ τοῦτον, *ob ea*, and at the same time to say, I make it an *Interrogative*, is according to Dr. *Bentley*'s way of representing things: he should either have been less severe with Me (*a*) on the account of My mistakes of this kind, or have taken more care to prevent his Own; some of which, since he condescends to these Trifles, I shall so far comply with him, as to give the Reader an account of.

(*a*) Nos *Phalarin* Grammaticum habemus, qui perperàm scripta etiam capite punit. *Cic. in Pison.*

P. 8. πίνας ἀν for πίνας ἂν. P. 19. Ετυξε for ἔτυξε. P. 18. μηδ' ἀν for μηδ' ἂν P. 21. ἐστι τὰς for εἰστὶ. P. 35. ὡς φάσι τινες for ὡς φασί τινες. P. 45. Ἰώνας for Ἴωνας. P. 48. ζώα for ζωά. Ibid. ἔγωδ' for ἐγὼ δ'. P. 61. πόλλα for πολλᾷ. P. 70. ἀν for ἂν. P. 94. σωίζεται δὲ for σωίζεται δὲ. P. 129. κτλίσειεν for κτλείσειεν. P. 138. ἡμεπαμίλιν for ἡμερομίλιν. P. 139. ἐλαβῶς for ἐλαβῶς. Ibid. Οὐδὲ οἱ for οὐδ' οἱ. Ibid. ἄδε for ἄδε. Ibid. ἐμετλεῖν for ἐμετλεῖν P. 146. ἔπειρεν for ἐπεῖρεν' &c.

The

The Reader will think the Controversy runs low when we begin thus to dispute about Accents and Enclyticks; and indeed I think so too: but how can I help it? My Excuse must be, that I was oblig'd to engage the Dr. in what way he lik'd best, and had not the Choice of my Own Weapons.

And now are not These, which I have gone thro', Mighty Blemishes to my Edition? and fit to be insisted on by the Dr, in order to Humble Me and *my Teachers?* He takes care to tell me, that he can produce more Instances of this kind; I question not but he may: but if he can find out no more Considerable Mistakes than these, I think he may leave off Criticising upon this Subject.

For my part, I am not much concern'd what the Men of Letters think of my Skill in Languages or Manuscripts: but it concerns Dr. *Bentley* to consider what the Men of Sincerity will think of his false and disingenuous Dealing; what the Men of Modesty and Humility will think of his Lofty Insulting Language; what the Men of Good Nature and Candor will think of his Fierce and Vindictive Temper: how the Men of Taste and Breeding will relish his Scurrilous Language, his Frigid Jests, his Low and Clownish Expressions; how the Men of Reason and Judgment will approve his Weak and Inconclusive Ways of Arguing: it is a mighty Imputation upon Him, to have any of these Bad Qualities, or to want any of these Good ones: but it is no Great Blot upon Me, if I should appear not to be exactly well skill'd in the Learned Languages.

I was

I was satisfied from some Books lately written, what a wide difference there is between a Man of Close Arguing, and Rambling Learning; and how unnatural a Step it is for an *Amanuensis* to start up a Professor of Divinity. This indeed made me not expect much from Dr. *Bentley* in the Reasoning Way: but when he came to Matters of Pure Criticism, I thought One, who had bent all his Thoughts and Reading that way, One who has now the sole Use and Power of the King's Library, and had for many Years attended upon one of the Greatest Scholars in *Europe*; One that set out with all these Advantages, I thought, might easily have confounded a Young Writer, that never aim'd at being a Critic in the Greek Tongue, or made the Niceties of it his peculiar Study and Business. But, to consult the several Editions, to collate the Manuscripts, to turn over Dictionaries, nay, and to make 'em; and all this ado, only to find a false Accent, and an Escape in perusing a Manuscript (which I have shewn to be the utmost of the Dr's Atchievement on this Article) seems to Me to savour too much of the Character of those men, who, as he himself makes the Observation, without considering whom it hits, love to make a Noise about Trifles; or (not to wrong him of his Own more Elevated Expression) *to make a Tide and a Flood in a Basin of Water.*

Nothing has done Learning more disservice among the Sensible part of Mankind, than that indiscreet Value, which Men of Letters oftentimes put upon the most trifling parts of Knowledge; that μικρολογία in the way of

of Scholarship, of which *Theophrastus* has given us a Character, as it relates to Human Life and Affairs 'Tis this that has brought so ill a Report upon Criticks and Criticism, and sunk extreamly the Value of that Sort of knowledge, which has been of such Excellent Use to the World when wisely employ'd.

A Good *Critic* is a Name that deserves Honour; for it carries in it Probity, Learning, Relish, Good Nature, and Good Sense, with a great many Other very desirable Qualities: but as the Word is now generally employ'd to signifie a Captious, Vain, Opinionative, Half-learn'd, Ill-natur'd Censurer of other Mens Labours, I must confess, I think nothing can be more despicable. Let us stop a while, e'er we take our Leave of this argument, to consider their several Characters.

A Good Critic distinguishes himself always by the Choice of his Subject; it is some Point of Importance, and worth determining: an Ill One is ever busied in things of no manner of Use nor Consequence; and yet is as full of Himself, and his Performances, as if the Commonwealth could not subsist without 'em.

A Good Critic is Modest and Decent in his Censures, Candid and Impartial; he treads warily, uses his Judgment much, but distrusts it more: speaks with Respect of those he differs from; never takes a pleasure in insulting over their Mistakes, or lessening their Reputations. *Isaac Casaubon*, *Ger. Vossius*, and *Grotius*, were all men of this Cast; and so was *Menage* too, till *Baillet*, toward the Latter End of his Life, provok'd him. The Character

racter which our Excellent *Pearson* * gives of him, is very remarkable, and fit to be consider'd by Dr. *Bentley* before he appears agen in the way of Criticism. *Quanta animi moderatio! quantus Candor! veram Criticam cum nullius famæ dispendio exercere; nullius Existimationem lædere, nullius Erroribus insultare, nusquam ex Mustaceo Laureolam quærere, per quos profecerit apertè profiteri; à Viris Doctissimis non, nisi salvo eorum honore, apertè dissentire: ut exclamare cogar, O Fecur vere Criticum sine Splene!* In which also he drew his Own, as well as *Menage*'s Character.

* *In his Letter to* Menage *before* Diogenes Laertius.

Salmasius and *Scaliger* had nothing of this in 'em, they were all Gall, and Pride, and Pedantry; which made the Vast Learning they were Masters of sit so ill upon 'em, that the World hated and despis'd 'em, at the same time that it was profiting by 'em: Mr. *Wotton* tells us, *There are some now alive whose Fame will one day equal that of the* Scaligers (or, as it is in his Last Edition, the *Salmasius's*) *and* Grotius's *of other Nations* †. If he had put *Salmasius* into *Grotius's*, and not into *Scaliger*'s Room, I would so far have agreed with him, that there are some now alive, who will inherit Their Fame, as to One great Part of their Character; for they have All their Ill Qualities in Perfection — with but a slight Mixture of any of their Good ones. For my part, were Dr. *Bentley* as great a Scholar, as Some say he is, or even as He thinks himself to be, yet I had rather not know the Greek Alphabet, than have his Knowledge and his Manners together: for as much

† *Reflect. upon Anc. and Mod. Learning*, p. 385.

much as I value Learning, I value Good Sense, and Common Civility more.

A Good Critic is rich in his own Store; he has a sure Fund of Good Judgment and True Knowledge, which he can trust to upon all Occasions, without needing to rifle his Neighbours: but an Ill Critic, who sets up the Trade without a Stock to manage it, must be perpetually upon the Plunder: the great Employment of his *Sagacity* is, to find out Hints in Odd Corners of Books, where 'tis probable no-body else will look for 'em; the chief Exercise of his *Judging* Talent lies in distinguishing, what Borrow'd Notions he may most safely put off for his Own, and with the least danger of being Discover'd.

A man of a sound and well-weigh'd Judgment is afraid always of standing by himself in a New Opinion; but a Smatterer in Criticism is bold, and forward; loves to maintain Paradoxes, and to defie the World. 'Tis enough to make him think a thing true or false, that every-body else has thought the contrary: for he has no way of Distinguishing himself, but by being Singular.

A Critic Really such, always proportions his pains to the difficulty of the matter he is engag'd in, and dwells upon things more or less, as they want more or less to be dwelt on: but a Pretender is constantly improper and impertinent in his Learning; where the Knott of a Dispute is, there You find him very reserv'd and silent; but he lets loose all his Criticisms upon You in plain points, that No-body is in danger of misunderstanding.

So

So have I seen the lost Clouds pour
Into the Seas an Useless Shower;
Whilst the vex'd Sailors curs'd the Rain,
For which Poor Shepherds pray'd in vain.

To compleat the Character of a Critic, it is requisite, that he should write well in that Way he pretends to censure, and be a Good Pattern, in order to be thought a Good Judge. The Ancient Criticks were generally so, as *Aristotle*, and *Longinus*, *Tully*, and *Quintilian*: but *Some now alive* have ventur'd to Criticize upon the Performances of very fine Pens, while they themselves had the worst in the World; and have set up for Judges of Good Writing by a Tast form'd upon the Opinions, and in a Style drawn from the Expressions of Modern Prefaces and Comments.

'Twere endless to reckon up all the Particulars that distinguish their Characters; instead on't, take a Reflection or two which Monsieur *St. Evremont* *, (a Fine Writer, and a Good Judge) has made on this Subject.

* Oeuvres mêlées, Troiseme Tome, p. 28.

I have seen (says he) *of Late Years, Great Criticks in abundance, but few Good Judges. That Learned Tribe is my Aversion, who are perpetually busie in restoring corrupted Passages, that when restor'd are at last worth nothing. They set the highest Price on such Knowledge, as one would chuse to be without, and know least of those things which most deserve to be known. Having no fine way of thinking and speaking themselves, they can never enter into the Delicacy of another Man's Thought or Expression. They would succeed very*

well in explaining and commenting upon a Grammarian; for His mind is thrown into much the same Mould with Theirs, and his Studies have lain the same way; but when they come to one of the Sensible and Wellbred Writers of Antiquity, they neither relish, nor understand him: his Sense and way of Thinking must needs be lock'd up to 'em, 'tis so very different from their Own. In History they know nothing of Men, or Affairs, they turn all to Chronology; and so they be but able to tell You, what Year Such an One was Consul, they care not whether they are acquainted with his Character, or the Great Events that happen'd in his Time. Cicero *with them goes only for a Maker of* Orations, Cæsar *for a Writer of* Commentaries; *the* Consul, *and the* General *are lost in 'em. The Genius that animates their admirable Writings is not felt; the Remarkable and Instructive Passages there are not observ'd.*

I beg the Dr's Pardon for leading him into such Writers as *Bruyere*, and *St. Evremont*, who think well, and speak Justly, and quote little; I know, upon all these Accounts, they are not for his Taste: to oblige him therefore, I will throw in a Little Latin here from the *Preface* of a *Modern Critic*; and I hope it will go down with him the better for the sake of the Place where I find it. *Hic Criticum*, says my Author, *non Pædagogico Fastu tumentem, aut Farragine quâdam Jejunæ Eruditionis onustum formare aggressus sum, sed non minus Judicio quàm Memoriâ suâ utentem; & qui probè calleat, quàm pauca penitùs in Veterum Monumentis intelligamus, ideóq; Modestè de aliis judicet, & ab Omnibus discere sit paratus. Volo eum ante omnia niti intelligere*

re quid Veteres velint ; & ſibi diligenter cavere, e Opinetur ſe Scire quod Neſciat *. Which Good Meaſures had Dr. *Bentley*, in his Criti- al Studies and Attempts, vouchſaf'd to ob- erve, he had ſav'd himſelf and Me the trou- le of this Public Diſpute about *Phalaris*: He ad not raſhly enter'd the Liſts upon an Ar- ument which he is by no means a Maſter of ; or begun an Indiſcreet Controverſie, without conſidering where it might End.

* Le Cler. Præf. ad Art. Crit.

He threatens me and the World with ſome urther Remarks of this kind in *Latin*: I am ot, I confeſs, very apprehenſive of that ; be- auſe, if he had intended to write in that Tongue, it had been proper to have done it t firſt : for in that Tongue the Reflection, that has given him all this Uneaſineſs, was written ; and in that Tongue therefore one would think it ſhould have been anſwer'd, nd this whole Controverſie manag'd. But whatever He may do, I cannot promiſe him that No other Language will be employ'd againſt him ; nor that the Enquiries of Some, whom he has affronted, will not be extended a little farther than theſe *Diſſertations*.

I was indeed in hopes, when I firſt put pen to paper, that the Diſpute would have lain purely between Us Two, and have been deci- ded by an Appeal to the Learned Men of our Own Nation : but I find the matter is not likely to reſt here ; Dr. *Bentley*'s Boaſts of his Correſpondence abroad, and of the Compli- ments that from thence have been paid him, have made it neceſſary to ſet Him and his Per- formances in as true a Light towards Foreign- ers, as they do or will appear in here at Home :

particularly to let Monsieur *Spanheim*, and Monsieur *Grævius* know how mistaken they have been in placing their Civilities upon One that does not deserve 'em; and can never be valu'd, but where he is not known.

If therefore I have not made use of all the Advantages against Dr. *Bentley*, which he has given me, nor display'd Him fully in all his Colours, those Defects, I hope, will soon be supply'd by a Better Hand, that intends to do right to the Subject, and to the Dr's Character, in a Tongue that will last longer, and go further: for since Dr. *Bentley* has *appeal'd* to *Foreign Universities*, to *Foreign Universities* he must *go*.

Dr.

Dr. *Bentley*'s Diſſertation UPON THE Fables of ÆSOP, EXAMIN'D.

I Had laid together ſome Short Remarks upon the Reſt of the Dr's *Appendix*, which were intended to accompany Theſe: but I ſhall be oblig'd to leave *England* before I can put 'em into Order. However, I cannot part with the Dr, till I have given him my Thoughts of his Performance on *Æſop*; and examin'd, whether he has any better Grounds for oppoſing his Judgment to Sir *William Temple*'s, in the caſe of the *Fables*, than in that of the *Epiſtles*. I cannot ſtay long enough on the Subject to do right to it; but what I ſhall be able to ſay, will, I hope, ſufficiently prove, that the Reaſonings and Diſcoveries in this latter part of his Work are perfectly of a piece with thoſe we have already had to do with; and, let him diſpute againſt *Phalaris*, or *Æſop*, or

what elſe he pleaſes, that Dr. *Bentley* will b
Dr. *Bentley* ſtill.

He ſets out well — *I am glad*, ſays he, *t*
find a good part of the Work done ready to m
hand. For Monſieur Bachet, *Sieur de* Meziriac
* Diſſert. *has writ the Life of* Æſop *in French* *. Which
P. 35. Life the Reader now ſuppoſes that Dr. *Bentley*
has read, and found to agree exactly with hi
own Sentiments; but to his Surprize 'twill ap-
pear, that the Dr. has neither read it, nor ſeen
it: for in the Next Line he confeſſes that he
could never meet with it. So that he finds his
Work done to his hands in a Book that he
has not yet found: Books Loſt, and Books
not yet come to his View, are as inſtructive
to Him as any Books in his Study. There is
no dealing with ſuch a Profound Scholar as
this, who is as well read in what he has not
ſeen, as in what he has. But perhaps here,
as in Other caſes, he has his accounts at Se-
cond Hand: not ſo neither, he is purely up-
on the Conjecture; and *can gueſs from the*
great Learning of the Author known to him by his
Other Works, that he has in a manner exhauſted
the Subject. That is, by his Mathematical
Notes upon *Diophantus* he can *gueſs* what he
ſays upon *Æſop*'s Fables. But, methinks, 'tis
a little nicely gueſs'd, that *Meziriac* has *in a*
manner exhauſted the Subject: why ſhould not
a Man that had written ſo well upon *Diophan-*
tus, have *quite* exhauſted it? I begin now to
gueſs ſomething too, and may be able to make
out my Gueſs e're I am a Month Older: I
am going into a Country where *Meziriac* is,
I ſuppoſe, to be had; and when I have ſeen
him, perhaps I ſhall find, that Dr. *Bentley* has
ſeen

ben him too —— tho' he has forgotten it. for he pretends to present us here *only with such Things as have escap'd the Observation of others*; and I now know him so well, that I aspect him a-Course whenever he sets up for Discoveries. The Business of *Ocellus* has given us One Remarkable Instance of this kind; and this small Piece we are upon will presently, even without the help of *Meziriac*, afford us Another.

The first of his *few loose Things which he fancies have escap'd the Observation of Others*, is, *that 'tis very uncertain if* (he would say *whether*) Æsop *himself left any Fables behind him in Writing*. This Hint has I believe escap'd the Observation of Others: for they that have observ'd any thing about it have observ'd the contrary. The Phrase of Antiquity is the same when they mention any thing of *Æsop*'s, as it would have been, had they thought *Æsop* really to have wrote it; the Ancients quote him just as they do Other Authors: When *Plato*, *Aristotle*, *Plutarch*, *Galen*, *Themistius*, *Gellius* cite any thing from him, 'tis ὡς ἔφη, ὡς ἔφασκε, ὡς ἔλεγε, καὶ ὁ Αἴσωπος, καὶ ὁ Αἰσώπου μῦθος, *inquit*, &c: and how would they have express'd themselves otherwise, if Æsop's Writings had confessedly lain before them? Dr. *Bentley* sure will not be so Captious as to say, that these Forms of Speech are not express enough; among all Authors that quote from others, ὡς ἔφη and ὡς ἔγραψεν, are Equivalent, and us'd indifferently. Bishop *Pearson* has largely prov'd this, in his *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ* *, against *Daillé*, who laid hold of this Cavil to disparage the Epistles of *Ignatius*: And

* Par. 2. p. 83.

And I the rather referr the Dr. to that Incomparable Work, because *he confesses with some Shame, that he had either never read it, or utterly forgot it* *. A good account of his Acquaintance with One of the First Books in the World, in the Way of his Profession! They that read Books at this rate, will be sure to write Books that will be so read. But not to forget our business — The Word ἐχεῖνα it self is apply'd to *Æsop*, as an Author, by *Suidas*, *Aphthonius* (*a*), and others: What *Suidas* says deserves a Reflection; his Words are, ἐχεῖνα τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς αὐτῷ συμβάν. ἐν βιβλίοις δ'. μᾶλλον δέ τινες φασὶ τὸν Αἴσωπον Ἀπορήματα γεγραφέναι μόνον, *i. e. he wrote Two Books of what befel him at* Delphos; *but Others are rather of Opinion that he wrote nothing but Fables* (*b*). So that tho' some doubted whether he wrote any account of what happen'd to him at *Delphos*, yet, according to *Suidas*, no-body doubted but that he wrote Fables. *Eustathius* calls him expressly not λογοποιὸς only, but μυθολόγον; expounding the one by the other †. The Words too of the Old Scholiast on *Aristophanes* are so full, I think, as not easily to be eluded; ὁ Αἴσωπος, says he, ἐν τοῖς μύθοις τὸ αὐτὸ λέγει (*c*). That Few say in Terms, he was a Writer, is because No-body had any Suspicions to the contrary: and when the Doubt was not started, nor thought of, there was no need to guard against it. I have produc'd some Ancients that say, he *did* write; Dr. *Bentley* does not pretend to instance in any that say, he *did not*: instead

* Dissert. p. 113.

(*a*) ἄριστα πάντων συγγεγράφθαι τοὺς μύθους· Προοιμ.

(*b*) *Suidas* explains ἀπορήματα by λόγους, in that very place.

† Ad initium Iliadis A.

(*c*) Sch. in *Plut.* 1124

stead of that, his best Arguments for this New Point are These that follow.

The Old Man in Aristophanes (says he *) *learnt his Fables in Conversation,* Ἐμαθεν ἐν Συμποσίῳ in which of his Dictionaries does Συμπόσιον signifie *Conversation?* Or is it necessary, that what was learnt at a *Feast* must be learnt in *Conversation?* might it not be a part of their Festival Entertainments, to have some agreeable Book read to them? and might not *Æsop* sometimes be that Book? If this might be the Case, then the Old man might learn his Fables at a Feast, and yet learn 'em out of a Book too. But suppose he did not, allowing that he learnt 'em in Conversation; what follows from thence? that, because the Fables of *Æsop* were in every-bodys Mouth, and told at their Meals, by way of entertainment, *therefore* there was no written Collection of 'em, they were preserv'd all by Memory. If this be Criticising, I am sure, Criticising has nothing to do with Reasoning. By the same way of Deduction will I prove, that we have not a *Written Creed* now, nor ever had one: for have not all People from the Rise of Christianity down to this Time learnt it, without the help of a Book? and is it not plain therefore that the Creed is preserv'd by Memory only, and has never been committed to Writing?

* P. 136.

The Dr. produces a Second Passage in *Aristophanes*, where one man reproaches anothers ignorance thus, Οὐδ' Αἴσωπον πώποτε, *You have not read so much as* Æsop; for so he himself translates it: *from whence*, he says, *one might conclude that* Æsop *wrote his Own Fables.* If they

they were his *Own* Fables, one might pretty safely conclude that he *wrote* 'em; for those *Writings* are the most properly a man's *Own*, which he *writes*. But Dr. *Bentley*, it seems, concludes from this very Passage, (I cannot imagine How) that *Æsop* did not write 'em. 'Till he tells us by what Wonderful Means he got to this Conclusion, I can say nothing to it. But as for his Occasional and Weighty Debate, whether or no ὁι Ἀιτιοπικ πιπάτηκες be a Proverbial Saying *spoken of Illiterates* *, I can see no manner of reason why it was brought in here, but meerly for the pleasure of contradicting *Erasmus* and *Scaliger*: Proverb, or no Proverb, I think, it equally proves, that there were Fables at that time, which went under the Name of *Æsop*; and what advantage can be made of this, must be against Dr. *Bentley*.

* Dissert. p. 136.

The Closing Argument, that winds these Proofs up into a Demonstration is a Passage in *Plato*'s *Phædo*, where *Socrates* says, ὁτ ποιηκεν ἔχοι, ἐκ ἠπιόμην μύθους τοὺς Αἰσώπου, τούτους ἐποίησα ὁις πρώτους ἐνέτυχον: *Among the Fables of* Æsop *I had* * or, knew at hand, *and remember'd* *, *I put those into Verse* to be Ειν, *that first occurr'd to me*: from whence the Dr. shrewdly observes, *that* Socrates *does not say he made use of a Book of Fables*; and from his not saying so would have us believe that there was no such thing as a Book of *Æsop*'s Fables in *Socrates*'s time. *Socrates* was now in Prison, and in obedience to a Divine Admonition thought himself oblig'd to do something in Poetry: he pitch'd upon *Æsop*, putting into Verse such of his Fables as occurr'd to him; and, if we may guess by what we have left of his

his doing, such Fables occurr'd to him as were neareſt his Own Caſe. Now what need was there of having recourſe to a Written *Æſop* for that which he and every-body remember'd? or what wonder was it, that he had not the Book by him in Priſon? why, we are not ſure that at the particular point of time, when he did theſe Fables in Priſon, he had ſo much as *Pen and Ink* allow'd him.

This is the Irreſiſtible Evidence, with which Dr. *Bentley* has taken upon him to confront the Opinion of Two Thouſand Years; ſuch Evidence as one would not admit againſt *Simmias Rhodius*, to rob him of the honour of his *Egg*, or his *Hatchet*. Is it fit, that men ſhould make uſe of their little Skill in Letters, their Conjectures, their Fancies, their Dreams, to attack the Reputation of our firſt Maſters in good writing? is it grateful with ſuch groundleſs Suſpicions as theſe to fall upon the Father of Moral Fable, whoſe happy way of conveying knowledge has been ever ſpoken of with ſo much Reſpect, and been of ſuch ſtanding Uſe to Mankind? Has Dr. *Bentley* ſworn to be at defiance, with every man that writes Maſterly in his way? Sir *William Temple* may be at Eaſe, he ſees he is affronted in Good Company. Let me tell our Critic, what I have heard from Wiſe Men, that Confidence and Paradoxes are not the true way to a Laſting Reputation; that the firſt point of Modeſty and Senſe is, never to Contradict the whole World Needleſly, and the next to that, to be ſure never to do it without very good Grounds.

The